

THE PROTESTANT

Editor: KENNETH LESLIE

Contributing Editor: PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

Associate Editors:

JAMES L. ADAMS, JOSEPH BRAININ, BEN RICHARDSON, GERALD RICHARDSON

Managing Editor: JAMES M. FREEMAN

Field Editor: W. ELLIS DAVIES

Editorial Advisers

RUTH NANDA ANSHEN
RUSSELL C. BARBOUR
C. HARRISON BECKER
G. A. BORGES
DWIGHT J. BRADLEY
OTTO BRAND
HENRIETTA BUCKMASTER
KARL M. CHWOROWSKY
JEROME DAVIS
JOSEPH F. FLETCHER
PAUL J. FOLINO
STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN
H. M. GOOCH
ANTONI GRONOWICZ
JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
LEONARD HELIE
CHESTER E. HODGSON
DANIEL HUGHES
EDWIN H. HUGHES

HEWLETT JOHNSON
CHARLES W. KEGLEY
J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR.
FREDERICK D. KERSHNER
JOHN A. LEE
B. B. COMER LILE
DAVID LORD
DONALD LOTHROP
J. A. MACCALLUM
JOHN A. MACKAY
JOHN MACMURRAY
NEIL MACNEIL
CLIFTON MACON
H. D. A. MAJOR
ANTONIO MANGANO
JOHN A. F. MAYNARD
FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL
JOSEPH G. MOORE
LOUIE D. NEWTON
ROBERT H. NICHOLS

JOSEPH NOVOTNY
EDWARD L. PARSONS
DRYDEN L. PHELPS
HAROLD C. PHILLIPS
EDWIN MCN. POTEAT
A. CLAYTON POWELL
TRACY M. PULLMAN
LEONHARD RAGAZ
LESLIE ROBERTS
RAYMOND ROBINS
D. R. SHARPE
ALVA TAYLOR
CHANNING H. TOBIAS
JACOB TRAPP
GREGORY VLASTOS
O. WALTER WAGNER
RUFUS W. WEAVER
HENRY N. WIEMAN
CLAUDE WILLIAMS

VOL. VI

OCTOBER, 1945

No. 8

KARL BARTH GOES LEFT

And other editorials by KENNETH LESLIE

World events which in this country appear to be driving certain left wing theologians to the right are in Germany driving certain right wing theologians to the left. The great Confessional leader, Karl Barth, for instance, has taken a step which can only be interpreted as a genuine move in the direction of the espousal of the people's cause. In a recent discussion between representatives of various political and religious organizations of the "Free Germany Movement" in Switzerland, including organizations extending from the Communists to members of the Protestant clergy, Professor Barth said:

"One of the definitely unsound things in our Germany of the past was the

fact that when Germans started to discuss politics they had the fatal tendency to fight immediately for ultimate aims. But this only intensifies antagonisms. This was an essential characteristic of the Germany of the past and I always considered it to be politically immature.

"Political rejuvenation would mean that whereas one has ultimate aims—for one cannot carry on politics without ultimate aims—nevertheless *everyone with his ultimate aims realizes that at the present moment we have common problems to solve.* Which party does not possess its ultimate aims, which means fighting the others tomorrow and the day after tomorrow? The question is: shall we work together in spite of this risk? But this risk exists for all. For instance, a man would not be a good Catholic who did not have the ultimate aim of a Christian Europe. We Protestants too, have our ultimate aims. That this is true of the Communists and Socialists is already well-known. This must be openly admitted by everyone.

"But political action is not made up of mutual threats and fears of one another. Politics is also a day-to-day task, a fact which the Germans of the past have not understood. It is the duty of all of us to work together seriously and to assume mutual responsibilities."

This statement from Karl Barth not only will mean much to the struggling democratic elements within Germany; it will also act as a brake on the escapist tendencies among Christian leaders in other countries. THE PROTESTANT welcomes this expression of political maturity on the part of a man whom we have had occasion to criticize in the past.

COMMONSENSE AND THE ATOM BOMB

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has called upon the United States government "to state now its intention to place the new discovery (of the atom bomb) under a world-wide authority as soon as all states will submit to effective controls." And also to "press without delay for the creation of such controls." In the complete text of this appeal it is stated that "every possible safeguard to protect man from the consequences of his own pride and greed is the urgent business of the churches." This may be so. We had always thought that it was the business of the churches not to protect man from the consequences of his pride and greed but to try to turn him against his pride and greed, to release him to humble and generous living. However, since the Federal Council has decided on this other course let's see how they propose to act. The statement goes on "We need to study and support all feasible social controls of all destructive atomic power . . . the establishment of a single world control of destructive atomic power is an urgent necessity. Unless it can be achieved in the short period while the United States alone possesses atomic bombs it may be difficult or impossible to achieve." The assumption here is clear, namely, that the United States is the only reliable moral sovereignty in the world, that if England or Russia had the bomb they might keep it for their own purposes and it would be harder to get them to give it over into the hands of a United Nations control. The Federal Council urges the United

States government to place the matter of bomb control before the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council. The Federal Council says however "It is not in our province to judge the technical requirements of international controls. We recognize the technical and political obstacles which stand in the way." But the issue is: "world control or world catastrophe."

It occurs to us that the Federal Council is here concerning itself with the wrong end of the chain of events which create war. It refuses to concern itself with the political obstacles and the technical requirements of international controls. Yet these are closer to the springs of action than the hand which releases the little egg of destruction from the belly of the bomber. The Federal Council takes refuge in the idea of the United Nations. But as recently as yesterday the world was confronted with worse than atomic destruction, destruction of the soul itself. The United Nations had nothing to do with destroying that awful threat. The United Nations are a concoction. The powers which destroyed the fascist threat to the soul of mankind were very few in number—the British Commonwealth of nations, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The leadership of France was more than half fascist, the leadership of the Latin American republics which form a large bloc in the United Nations are fascist-minded to say the least. It would be common sense (and we believe it is the essence of religion to employ common sense) to put our faith in those powers which have smashed the fascist threat to the soul of mankind when considering agencies of protection against the atomic threat to the body of mankind.

"DIVINITY" OF BIG BUSINESS

Out of man's teeming millions there are always specially gifted ones, men who track down and destroy disease, creators of symphonic poems, tellers of significant tales, social statesmen, scientists, engineers, inventors, and so forth. Albert Einstein is one such today whose supreme gifts none would deny.

No way has been discovered to guarantee greatness in a line of human breeding. It may be possible to breed talent, but not genius. Out of the nameless ocean of humanity a Name is thrown up to glisten for a moment in the light of the sun, then to fall back and lose itself in the deep tide once more. The biological descendants of the great names of history are all about us yet we know them not. The children of Shakespeare may today be unable to read. The children of the great Reformers may today be Christian Fronters. The children of Jacobite royalists may today be fighters for democracy.

Humanity's proud stunted growths have a natural hatred for excellence and an insatiable desire to drag it down to their own dead level. Man-off-the-track yearns and strives and strains to pull all other men off the track. Not only misery but sin too likes company. Disease is enraged by health, blindness by sight, ignorance by knowledge, hate by love.

This rage of jealousy organizes itself against the enemy, makes a norm of mediocrity, outlaws all eager and percipient and adventurous living, and does it in

the name of some prophet of this very same adventurous living it so much hates. We kill our prophets first with stones and then with statues.

The gravitational force of stuntedness organizes itself into institutions built around the *substance* of *stuntedness* and the *name* of *excellence*. These institutions, like the Vatican in Europe and the Imperial House in Japan, add their weight to the oppressive hand of power against which men must fight for their freedom. These institutions gather up everything revered in men's past, everything noble and exalting, and turn it all into a weapon of oppression and degradation. The ideas against which these institutions fight are the democratic ideas of the nobility, even the divinity, of man as man, *of all men*. If all men are kings no man can be King. If all men be gods no man is God.

Any honest man with an ordinary American public school education would see the puerile outpourings of the present head of the Vatican for what they are, dreary, legalistic, commonplace, related to the current world struggle only in its peevish negation. Yet this verbiage has been spread on the front pages of our great newspapers with all the reverence due to genius itself. Thus is the noble struggle of mankind slighted and scorned by the organized power of frustration. The God-Emperor of 78 million Japanese, late ruler of the whole of East Asia is a little man who seldom speaks or is seen. In both the East and the West these God-men, one representing the Son, the other the Sun, throughout the holocaust in which they both had a material interest and during which they formed a tentative and wary partnership, maintained, and still maintain now that their little adventure is over, that *they are devoted lovers of peace*. In the West, after honoring Father Tiso for selling out to Hitler and preparing the betrayal of Slovakia, after blessing the butcher Franco, after honoring such miscreants as Laval and Von Papen, architects of war, while doing these things and after doing these things the Papacy has never ceased extolling peace. Just so, now we learn from the Japanese Imperial household minister, "His Majesty is a profound lover of peace."

These God-men and those who control them are not entirely insincere. They do want peace and they weep over those misled people who resist the peace which the Japanese warrior or the Fascist warrior would bring them.

Neither Hirohito nor Pius XII is on our list of war criminals. Neither of them will be on that list. Neither will our lists contain the names of those shrewd capitalists who collaborate with the God-men. After all has not capitalism become a religion? Does not one hear the same hushed tones of awe and reverence at the approach of John D. Rockefeller or Henry Ford? We remember on one occasion at a meeting of ministers having the brashness to suggest that perhaps the influence of Mr. Rockefeller might have something to do with the impotence of Mr. Fossdick. How the clergy hissed and booed and shouted "You can't say such things!" It is true. You can't say such things. One simply doesn't say such things.

In other words what we are confronted with today is *the Religion of Capitalism*. That is why it is taboo to suggest that a capitalist be hailed into the world's criminal court. Until we can break this taboo, the people of the world will not be safe from the curse of ecclesiastical-capitalistic imperialism. These taboos must be broken.

ANSWER TO "THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER"

A Review Editorial by KENNETH LESLIE

THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER, by Paul J. Tillich, Theodore M. Greene, George F. Thomas, Edwin E. Aubrey, John Knox. Edited by Henry P. Van Dusen. Scribners, New York, 1945, pp. 194 with index, \$2.50

This book is small but important, especially to the Christian ministry; its authors are respected men in their field and will be listened to. According to Professor Van Dusen the book is addressed primarily to those "somewhat outside the Christian tradition." Its writers, he says, "have felt to the full" the world's present agony.

Paul Tillich has been assigned the job of analyzing the present world situation or problem and he also gives guide-posts for the Christian answer to it. He sketches the rise of the present world situation in three periods:

(1) The crushing of feudalism and church absolutism and the rise of bourgeois life with its faith in reason and in the inherent goodness of man, with its economy of laissez-faire and its principle of automatic harmony.

(2) The rulers of bourgeois society employing reason in their new construction became preoccupied with *technical* reason and sacrificed reason in the sense of truth and justice. "The transformation of *revolutionary reason* into *technical reason* was the decisive feature of the transition from the first to the *second period of modern society*." (p. 4) Men created a world-wide mechanism of large scale production and competitive economy. This mechanism became a Leviathan. What were the driving forces of this system? Professor Tillich says "the profit of the few and the poverty of the many," what the old-fashioned socialist orators used to call the System.

(3) Today. Feudalism and absolutism are gone except for vestiges which remain "powerful enough to allay the transmutation of all social life into a market-system." (p. 6) Bourgeois society is breaking down and its faith in "automatic harmony" is being undermined. The validity of this faith, it now becomes obvious to Professor Tillich, was dependent upon the carry-over of traditional values. When these factors fell out of history the inadequacy of the principle of automatic harmony was bared. Then came the attempts to replace it by planned economy. "Rationalization" was invoked.

So far, very good. From here on not so good. "Totalitarianism was the first step in this direction. One expression is the *Fascist systems*." "In certain important respects, the Fascist systems mark an advance beyond bourgeois society. They have provided minimum security for all. They have re-introduced unsailable authorities and commanding obligations." (pp. 6, 7)

Clerical-Fascists will be comforted to read this and especially to read Professor Tillich's final reason for the failure of the fascist systems, "Absolutism returned, but without the social, cultural and religious traditions which furnished solid foundations for the earlier absolute systems." (p. 7) We may depend upon it these sentences will be quoted approvingly in the clerical press.

Now follows, and we are pained to note it, a version of the Communazi fable. "The other radical expression of the trend toward a planned society is the *Soviet*

system. It could succeed for the same reasons which brought partial success to the Fascist systems. And it achieved an even greater security for the masses. Moreover, it has retained, at least in principle, revolutionary reason as an ultimate critical principle." (p. 7) The phrase "at least in principle" dashes any hope that Professor Tillich might soften his condemnation of the Soviet system which, he says, "also was a return to absolutism without the traditional foundations." These paragraphs cruelly bracket the Fascist and Soviet systems. "Both systems are reactions against the bourgeois faith in automatic harmony. Both are ambiguous: on the one hand, they attempt to bring the incalculable mechanism of world economy back under the control of man; on the other hand, they aggravate the self-destructive forces generated by the second stage of bourgeois society." (p. 7) It is difficult to deal seriously with this kind of "thinking." The man-eating Leviathan took two forms, Fascist and Soviet. Fascism is gone; the Soviet is left. Is not this a convenient suggestion to drop into the mind of an anti-Soviet war instigator? Is this really the Christian answer to the present day problem? Insofar as the Papacy represents Christendom this is definitely the Christian answer. Insofar as Niemoller, Faulhaber & Company represent Christendom, this is the Christian answer. Insofar as American Protestantism has joined the American hierarchy in its efforts to whip up a war against the Soviet Union it is the Christian answer. But we do not believe it is the Christian answer.

TILlich'S MECHANOPHOBIA

Professor Tillich correctly states: "Man is fully rational only on the foundation of, and in interdependence with, non-rational factors. Therefore the predominance of technical reason evoked a reaction by the vital forces in man. They arose and made themselves manifest in both theory and practice. Whether called 'instinct' or 'passion' or 'libido' or 'interest' or 'urge' or 'will to power' or 'élan vital' or 'unconscious ground', they cannot be denied." (pp. 11, 12) But let us notice that Professor Tillich uses here all the Fascist catch cries, whereas "brotherhood," "comradeship" are Communist catch-cries and they are drawn up from non-rational sources too in the sense in which he uses the word. We have seen many Russian motion pictures during the past few years and without exception they have projected these ideas of brotherhood in the most effective way possible, without putting tags on them, not calling them "Communist," or "Bolshevik" or "Christian" but presenting them in concrete human situations in such a manner that they speak eloquently for themselves. They have never presented the individual as existent for the state, but have always presented the state as the servant of the individual. We do not wish here to minimize the danger of the servant becoming the master. That danger was clearly foreseen by Lenin. Stalin has repeatedly uttered warnings against it. Professor Tillich says "The vitalistic protest against the mechanization of man is as ambiguous as reactions against Leviathan in other realms." (p. 12) But the Communist protest is not ambiguous, either in its intent or in its effect. Professor Tillich has some exceedingly wise things to say about the exploitation of the unconscious by consciousness. Does he perhaps fall victim to his European-ness or, more specifically, his German-ness? We hesitate to ascribe to him a certain provincialism but he does

seem not to have given sufficient weight to the importance of the cooperative movement and the nonconformist conscience in England nor to the free Evangelical movement in America. Yet in certain sentences he modifies his sweeping views. "In Russia, the majority of the populace were hardly touched by the disintegration of community. In America, the Protestant humanist ideals of personality and community are still vital in large sections of the country. In Asia, the family system resisted bourgeois atomization." (p. 13) But this doesn't really matter because "all these forms are under continuous and advancing attack. The dissolution of family, of neighborhood, of personal cooperation is rapidly progressing." Youth groups, for example, which sought escape from the general process of mechanization were caught by the totalitarian movements and made to serve them. "These groups which now embrace the whole younger generation in Fascist and Communist countries are 'commanded' communities. . . . Unconditional surrender to an unconditionally accepted purpose, resignation of any kind of autonomy, fanatical devotion are features of their existence. These are consciously dehumanized groups of human beings, very different from the automatically dehumanized industrial masses of the nineteenth century." (p. 14) A question occurs here: Were the mass of common folk *humanized* in *any* previous age? Only if they were can they be said to have been *dehumanized*. It is difficult, for instance, to think of a humanized person who is nameless; yet the masses of common folk throughout history have been nameless. In looking at the modern machine with all its dehumanizing effects we tend to forget the "man with the hoe" whose dehumanization may have been no less. Anyway Professor Tillich comes to the pessimistic conclusion that "the struggle against the dehumanization produced by the mechanism of modern capitalism has used even more fully mechanized methods and has thus carried through the process of dehumanization to its logical end." (p. 15) This is pretty but we believe extremely questionable, because it would lead one to think that mechanization is in itself essentially dehumanizing. This is not so. It is man alone who dehumanizes man and he can do it as well with a hoe as with an assembly line. The battle of the Soviet Union is *not* against "the dehumanization produced *by the mechanism* of modern capitalism," but against the dehumanization of man *by man through modern capitalism*, whether modern capitalism has turned into a mechanical process or not, and in this battle the Soviet Union uses not "more fully mechanized methods" but more scientific and rational methods, which is quite as it should be.

AIDING THE BETRAYAL OF MAN

Professor Tillich makes a good job of describing how education, both technical and humanist, is made to subserve the capitalist system. "To be sure, this was often hidden to the educators as well as to those educated . . . the cultural achievements of the past wove an idealistic veil over the nakedness of this education and hid the face of Leviathan who was its real master. . . . In the measure that education has been subjected to the mechanism of modern society, it has lost its relation to truth and justice and consequently any ultimate meaning." (p. 16) In particular, religious education, which was originally "introduction into the tradition, the faith, and the sacramental experience of the Christian Church," now serves "autonomous reason"

which is no longer autonomous but serves bourgeois society or national "socialism."

Professor Tillich does not state it explicitly but he clearly implies that education as the search for truth and justice had a better time of it when it was "Christian." Every move away from the time when the Church was its determining center is described as a move away from its ultimate meaning. He describes how it has become "a ready victim of various kinds of non-rational powers which seek to give it meaning." (p. 16)

But the power of God unto righteousness is one kind of non-rational power in the sense used by Professor Tillich. The tragedy of becoming a victim of non-rational power takes place when the non-rational power is an evil power. *It is the duty of spiritual leadership to discriminate among the social and political forms in the world, to discover those which make for the life more abundant, to celebrate those forms of life which warm life and encourage it and deepen it, to proclaim God's democracy as it appears in history, with the soil of the world on its features, real, actual, alive, not unsullied, spotless, dead.* Christian leadership is not rising to this challenge. If one should judge by this book Christian leadership not only fails to rise to this challenge but is actually giving aid and comfort to the enemy of life. To bracket Nazism and Communism as two forms of modern oppression is literally to aid in the betrayal of man. It does not merely affect the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It affects crucially at the present moment the struggle of the Chinese people against their oppressors, the Kuomintang and its Japanese and puppet allies. These Chinese are the world's heroes today. Their cheerfulness, their fantastic courage and patience, their devotion to the cause of human dignity have endeared them to that part of the world outside China which still possesses the ability to perceive greatness. But these Chinese heroes call themselves by the name Communist, the hated name. They are despised and persecuted for righteousness sake, and now to complete matters along come these theologians led by the great Paul Tillich to add the authority of the Christian faith to their already heavy burden of hate.

THE MODERNIZED IVORY TOWER

Professor Tillich speaks against himself when he says that "Christianity must denounce equally a religious utopianism which talks about abolishing the profit motive by persuasion in order to evade necessary social transformation, and a religious escapism which proclaims a transcendent security of eternal values in order to divert the masses from their present economic insecurity." (p. 21) It could hardly be better said but what does he say about Russia where the "necessary social transformation" has not been evaded but has been accomplished? "In Russia," he says, "private ownership of industry was completely abolished and the entire economy is dominated by a bureaucracy interested in furthering production and in the prestige and power associated with it, but not in private profits." (p. 20) In other words the Russian economy has substituted prestige and power for profits. It is difficult to find words sufficiently strong to condemn such an interpretation of the Soviet system. This is out-Koestlering Koestler.

What does Professor Tillich think Christianity should do? It should "support plans for economic reorganization which promise to overcome the antithesis of

absolutism and individualism, even if such plans imply a revolutionary transformation of the present social structure and the liquidation of large vested interests." (pp. 21, 22) But this "promise to overcome the antithesis of absolutism and individualism" can never be accomplished in such fashion as will please these Christian platonists. In almost every one of Tillich's sentences he introduces some such word as this word "promise." Blueprints and plans and promises are items with which Christian idealists are thoroughly intimate but when somebody begins to fulfill a plan and in the fulfillment finds it necessary to destroy a tree or drive a nail through a piece of wood, then the Christian idealist rises in his holy wrath, lifts his skirts high from the soil of harsh reality and bounds upstairs, two steps at a time to the safety of his ivory tower. Once there he issues anathemas against those miserable sinners who dared to turn his plan into bricks and mortar. These Christian idealists meet from time to time in retreats to warm each other up. Cozy in some seminary or summer resort they punctuate their day with vocal exclamations voicing the hope that they may become more like "Our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ." Now it is true that Jesus went to the mountain and talked with Elijah, but Jesus got into nothing but trouble from this communing with his spiritual forbears. We will be very much surprised if the authors of this book get into any trouble over it.

TILlich'S ANSWER IS AMBIGUOUS TOO

The role of Christianity today, says Professor Tillich, is "one of both adaptation to and transcendence over the present world situation." (p. 34) We would rather he had said the role of Christianity should be one of creativity *within* the present world situation. Then he adds that "the growth of secular *arts* independent of the Church not only impoverished the religious arts but secularized them. They became secular arts with a religious content instead of religious art with a universal content." (p. 35) This too appears to be an unfortunate way of expressing it. Secular art, such as the painting of Van Gogh, is deeply religious and more universal than Christian ecclesiastical art just *because* it is secular and is not limited in appeal by special symbolism. Professor Tillich admits, however, that "the problem of religious art as the expression of true religious reality has not yet been widely recognized within the Christian Churches." This is a cry in the dark. We believe that Professor Tillich is inwardly pessimistic regarding the Christian Church, and we believe it for this reason: when it comes to delivering himself of the positive Christian message he is halting; he either stutters and says nothing or his phrases are propositions right out of the theological ice-box. He does not even bother to try to warm them up or to serve them in meaningful terms to the spiritually hungry human masses of mankind. He calls for some kind of union between the secular realm and the religious realm in order that we may have a new unity of cult and art. He is correct when he says that "Christianity cannot change this situation merely by ritual reforms." This is because, as we have often expressed it, there is no greater lie than truth removed from life. There is no greater emptiness than ritual which does not celebrate living breathing reality.

The greatest parasitism of all time is the parasitism of Christian churches on the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth, the whole point of whose example and teach-

ing was to make men share his creative heritage. Instead of this the churches have so often reversed the whole meaning of Jesus, turned it upside down, made it into a debaser instead of an uplifter of human nature, twisted the doctrine of humility into a doctrine of slavery. The Christian churches as they stand today are largely doomed. What life there is in them will be used by morally indignant men and by spiritually sensitive men who can no longer abide its intellectually involved moral blindness. Jesus is not lost through the shame of the churches. There will be other churches or groups or meetings of men. Men will always come together to think about the ultimate purpose of their lives. It is of the nature of man to ask himself ultimate questions which can only be answered with a song or a sigh and which are only mocked by the products of minds lustful of encompassing the eternal verities. There is a No Man's Land between poetry and metaphysics where the philosophers must forever wrangle. This is a necessary evil, but let not philosophers enter the pure land of song where children may move freely and to which innocence and simplicity alone hold the key.

Professor Tillich says that "the emergence of autonomous *personalities* and *communities* has virtually destroyed true religious personality and community." (p. 35) Destroyed the old, yes, but has it not also cleared the ground for the new? In expanding this very remark he uses a strange parallel. He speaks of "Dostoyevsky's vivid contrast between Jesus' personal confrontation with God and the Inquisitor's secular arrogance" as an example of the battle to maintain true religious personality. Secular seems an odd adjective to apply to the Inquisitor's arrogance. Would it not have been more appropriate to place Jesus in the secular category and the Inquisitor in the religious?

There are several seeming contradictions in Tillich's essay. For instance in his attack on the triumph of autonomous knowledge which has pushed aside religious knowledge he says that "Christ is regarded merely as an historical person whose character and very existence are at the mercy of the conclusions of historical research. . . ." (p. 37) But later he praises the historical criticism of the Bible which "has liberated the Christian truth from legendary, superstitious and mythical elements in the historic tradition," (p. 40) and says that without this Christianity could not have confronted the modern mind and made its message intelligible. Then again, on the one hand he says that the churches lack the power to furnish the answers thrust forward by the present world situation "because they themselves have become instruments of state, nation and economy," (p. 38) and that both in Europe and in America "the Churches largely surrendered their critical freedom." (p. 38) But on the very next page he says that "in many respects and to varying degrees, Christianity has transcended modern culture," (p. 39) and on a later page that "the church has succeeded in maintaining an authentic spirituality and transcendence," (p. 42) and has resisted the domination of technical reason and technical economy over human life. Finally he says that the ecumenical movement "is the only world unity left in the present demonic disruption of humanity," (p. 43) This is, coming from Paul Tillich, astounding.

At the end of Professor Tillich's essay he gives five guide-posts for the Christian answer. First he says that it will be true and convincing and transforming and ecumenical.

menical and so forth. Second he says that the modern development is ambiguous; there are some good things about it. He has dealt mostly with the bad. The main good thing is that it raises reason as the principle of truth "above all forms of authoritarianism and obscurantism." (p. 44) He goes on to say that this is "a truly Christian issue even if it be fought out largely in humanistic terms." Correct. A Christian issue, but scarcely a Christian answer. Third he speaks of "the tragic self-destruction of our present world," and of the Christian insight that man in all his achievements turns against himself. "Therefore the Christian message cannot anticipate a future situation devoid of tragedy even if the demonic forces in the present situation be conquered." There is a contradiction within this very paragraph. If the world has destroyed itself then how can its demonic forces be conquered. This is religious escapism through an indulgent use of the conception of tragedy. Professor Tillich's fourth point is that "Christianity does not give its answer in terms of religious escapism," but he has already built a wonderful case for sitting by the slate-gray sea and watching the gulls make circles in the sky. Fifth and last he says that Christians must wrestle with the times and that "the Christian Churches are the historical group through which the answer must be given." We turn to the next author.

THEODORE M. GREENE ON SECULARISM

The essay following Professor Tillich's is by Theodore M. Greene who describes three secular attitudes toward Christianity: (1) The attitude of the ordinary man who is largely indifferent to religion and who makes no effort to find significance in his life. Professor Greene quotes T. S. Eliot's picture of the average man's face behind which you see "the mental emptiness deepen leaving only the growing terror of nothing to think about. . . ." These people, says Professor Greene, are hungry for what Christianity has to offer. "If the Christian Church does not reach them, as it can and should, some great secular movement may well engulf them, perhaps in the near future. Like Communism and Fascism, such a movement is likely to assume a quasi-religious character. . . ." (p. 49) Many would welcome such a movement. "Sincere and enlightened Christians would also welcome it insofar as it did, in fact, promote genuine human welfare; but they must fear it in proportion as it substituted false gods for the true God and rested on an unrealistic and utopian conception of man's ability to save himself entirely by his own efforts." (p. 49)

This statement is misleading in that it brackets Communism and Fascism as if they were both humanist movements looking toward the betterment of mankind and failing because of similar reasons. But this is a derivative rather than a basic error in Professor Greene's thinking. A hint as to this basic error (and this is perhaps the basic error throughout the writings of these theologians who, after all, belong more or less to one school of thinking) is in their setting a gulf between man and God, as if man in his true humanity could ever for one moment escape doing business with God.

The second attitude towards Christianity, according to Professor Greene is "naive and sophisticated naturalism." (p. 49) For an example of the naive naturalism he chooses Somerset Maugham. Sometimes it represents the healthy adolescent

rebellion against parental orthodoxy. However it is not healthy if it is not outgrown but hardens into a dogmatic self-satisfied naturalism. Professor Greene then takes up some sophisticated naturalists like Professor Sidney Hook whom he very properly and effectively puts in his place as a narrow-minded complacent dogmatist. Professor Greene wisely says that "argument is futile which is not rooted in a common sense of need." (p. 61)

THE CHRISTIAN AND THE HUMANIST

The third attitude is that of "humanism, assured or anxious." (p. 62) "Some humanists who read these pages may feel a sufficiently acute sense of need . . . to desire . . . a restatement of the central Christian affirmations . . ." (p. 62) Others will not. It is to these others Professor Greene speaks. He cites R. P. Blackmur's projection of "the effort to discover and unite by secular means the common beliefs of the actual world." (p. 63) (*The Partisan Review*, Summer, 1944) This is a far cry from the aggressive naturalism of Sidney Hook.

Blackmur travels a road on which Greene might meet him, come near enough at any rate to call across from his road to Blackmur's. Instead he fails to communicate with Blackmur. Although Blackmur appeals to Christians not to impair man's corporate efforts to combat the forces of evil by insisting on beliefs, which non-Christians cannot accept, Professor Greene feels it necessary to deny this appeal because sincere Christians are "convinced that man cannot save himself solely by his own efforts, that this humanistic optimism, even the qualified optimism of Mr. Blackmur, is utopian, that what the humanists call the 'supernatural' does exist, and that the only realistic procedure is *to make use of the spiritual as well as the purely human*, resources which are available to man." (p. 64) (Our italics) Then Professor Greene uses an illustration from the field of medicine. He says that a primitive savage who had no faith in modern medicine might quite reasonably, from his point of view, urge those in his society who did believe in medicine to boycott medical practices which he and his friends could not support. But a modern doctor would have to stand his ground and insist that it was the savage, and not he, who was being unrealistic.

The illustration seems unfortunate. Usually such illustrations are used by anti-religionists, the savage being the religionist and the modern doctor being the scientist who has got away from all that. The illustration works just as badly in either case and betrays in its user the same misunderstanding of what religion is. May we suggest to Professor Greene that religion is not a resource added on to those human resources which are available to man. *Human resources and human efforts are used religiously when they are aimed at a communion with the Creator of the world through a creative relationship with some part of His world.* Such a relationship might be expressed in terms that would make sense to Mr. Blackmur.

Professor Greene puts the issue sharply between the humanist and the Christian. If there is no God then Christians are "wasting time and energy on religious activities that should be devoted to wholehearted humanistic endeavor." (p. 65) On the other hand, if there is, it is the humanists who are unrealistic and utopian and "doomed to ultimate frustration."

Is there not a point beyond this confrontation of "God" and "no God" and therefore of humanist and Christian? We believe that it is the duty of the theologian to teach something to the Christian as well as to the humanist. Some Christians believe there is a God, sing hymns and say prayers which they conceive to be heard by this God and lead lives in obedience to the commands of the being they conceive of as God; yet these same Christians *may be possessed by an illusion regarding the nature of God, may be unrealistic regarding His desires* and may be therefore also "doomed to ultimate frustration." On the other hand there are some humanists who do not believe in God but *who live their lives in obedience to the laws of their enrichment and in a completely happy and realistic fashion*. They do not appease their world but they are at ease within themselves as they strive to change their world. They are at ease because they respect the nature of the materials they work with and they pursue reality in all its richness and depth, not flinching in the face of its contradictions, rejoicing in new insights and in the creation of new forms of life. The most typical of such humanists today are pure scientists. These are our modern saints. They are devoted to the service of truth. Their supreme virtues are those of humility and obedience to truth. The truth to which they are obedient is indeed their fiercely jealous "God." This truth is their ultimate. Cause leads to effect. A "God" who can be asked to break the chain of cause and effect is the enemy of the truth and therefore of the scientist who seeks it. He does not recognize "God" for the simple reason that theologians have not yet presented God in such fashion that He will not interpose Himself in their equations.

LITTLE TO SAY TO THIS GENERATION

Christians, says Professor Greene, "can, and indeed they should, cooperate with humanists as fully as possible for the realization of all human ends which both consider desirable. These include all alleviation of human suffering, all promotion of peace, order, and justice, all forms of education which free man from the tyranny of ignorance and cultivate his natural sensitivity to human values—in short, all that contributes to human well-being. Christianity is not other-worldly in the sense of being indifferent to man's welfare on earth, nor is it opposed to these cultural values. Its refusal to accept them as constituting the whole of human welfare is not a denial of their positive value; its insistence that they are subordinate to man's communion with God places them in what, from the Christian point of view, is the only proper context." (p. 67) Here our divergence from Professor Greene is plain. Instead of calling these activities "subordinate to man's communion with God" we should rather call them *the very language of man's communion with God*, the means through which man communes with God. As the old monks put it, *laborare est orare*.

If the humanist works to promote justice and truth and freedom, works faithfully and persistently to these ends then the humanist is acting on the premise that these ends are better than other ends such as the pursuit of momentary pleasure. In other words the humanist's premise may include a recognition that human life was meant to go *this way, not that way*; but even if the humanist recognizes no

tendency in life, even if he refuses to go beyond his own feeling of sympathy this should be the last thing to come between him and the Christian and the Christian should be the last person on earth to refuse to leap this barrier and to grasp the humanist by the hand. Professor Greene puts the horse behind the cart. Communion with God by man comes only through man's experience in the world. For instance Robert Frost's poems are nothing less than celebrations of religious experiences on the part of Robert Frost. Yet the poet scarcely ever uses the word God, and we would not be surprised if Frost thinks of himself as a humanist. Read the poem "The Axe-Helve." It is instinct with the deepest possible perception of life. It celebrates a moment of mystical realism in an encounter with an axe-helve maker, a moment of creativity at the height of which a piece of carved wood takes on personality. We fear that Frost teaches religion better than these theologians.

There is no richness of content in the descriptions of man's encounter with God in this book. The picture we get from reading in Professor Greene's chapter, for instance, of the "Thou-I relation of God to the human soul" is that of a transaction, if it can be imagined, between a *little vacuum* and a *Big Vacuum*. His descriptions of Christian experience seemed to us to be written from the outside with no truly revealing knowledge of the distinguished characteristics of the consciousness of Jesus. Much of his defensive polemic is excellent. He knows how to handle the aggressively dogmatic humanist or positivist. He can take care of the usual objections to the Church because most of the objections he cites do not cut very deep. He has not much to say to the children of this generation.

THROUGH A THEOLOGICAL GLASS DARKLY

The next essay is by George F. Thomas who deals with "Central Christian Affirmations." The remedy for man's disintegration lies "in a recovery of the theocentric view of life." A living God has spoken and continues to speak to men. God reveals himself to men. He does it in order to bring them into fellowship with His own life and obedience to His will. Faith is a response of the whole personality of man to the revelation of God. God is righteous, merciful, dynamic, creative. Professor Thomas has a section on the doctrines of creation, man, and sin. There is nothing here either to shock or enlighten the complacent blind of this generation. Christ is viewed by Christians as the redemptive power of God incarnate in a perfect man. This view, he says, grew out of St. Paul even more than out of the impression made by Jesus on his living companions. The Council of Chalcedon in the fifth century tried to safeguard the human nature of Jesus and the unity of his personality against the tendency to divide him into a man on the one hand and a God on the other. The Council said that Christ was in all respects like the rest of us human beings, *apart from sin*. As Professor Thomas says this was "an attempt to put into words what cannot be put into words." Professor Thomas asks the fruitless question, "Will the Kingdom of God be realized *within the limits of history or beyond history in a heavenly state?*" (p. 131) Now whatever Messianic or cosmological views Jesus may have held we may be certain that he did not conceive of two sets of laws, one for here and the

other for the hereafter. A law of life was a law of life wherever life proceeded. The news which Jesus brought was good news for the people who heard him and exactly as good news for you and me today. It was an announcement of the way to get the best out of life. Nothing more than that and nothing less. Professor Thomas speaks of the eternal life after death and contrasts it with life before death, repeating one of the toughest-to-kill of all Christian heresies. Professor Thomas does say that "the hope of eternal life does not prevent Christians from seeking to *approximate the Kingdom in history* . . . Indeed, it gives them a strong incentive to do so, for it puts their earthly efforts in a wider setting and enables them to see the eternal significance of that which they do in time." (p. 133) Here again is the fatal dichotomy which runs through this book.

Professor Thomas shows skill *within* the language of theology, discoursing on vicarious suffering, salvation by faith, and so on, but he with the others still lacks the impulse or the power to give life to these dead phrases by translating them into modern parables. Theology too has a cross to bear and this is it. These men do not take up that cross. They remain comfortably outside of life. They still look through a theological glass darkly. We cannot remain indifferent to this polite obscurantism, for it leads into a trap. Clerical-Fascists can use the language of this book. They can quote with smacking lips the conclusion of Professor Thomas that "the answer of Christianity to the *need of modern society* is reconciliation with God through faith and transformation by the love which was in Christ." Msgr. Sheen or Father Coughlin would say amen to that. It is the kind of language that gives no whisper of a hint as to what it means to a man caught alive in the vise of today's decisions. The reverend fathers will translate these words into their church. They are at least concrete. And, since their church has been actively anti-Communist to the point of being pro-Fascist, the words thus become for them weapons in the concrete battle raging today throughout the world. Our "Protestant" theologians keep their words out of the concrete battle and in so doing betray hard-pressed humanity in its fight against the oppressor. In a sense Professor Thomas has even less courage than Tillich who dared to name and to bracket the two opposite poles of the battle as if they were allies and were to be beaten by ecumenical Christendom. Professor Thomas will probably repudiate indignantly our categorization of his words which *can be interpreted (as he himself no doubt means them)* to comfort man's present fight for freedom. But he has not made sure of their meaning by applying them to the current scene. He has left the street of his words open for two-way traffic. The tragedy is that the Fascists will crowd the street and the anti-Fascists will be compelled to think that it is the street called Fascist.

AUBREY DOES NOT POINT THE WAY

In chapter four Edwin E. Aubrey presents the Christian answer to the social problem of our generation. "From Dr. Tillich's massive indictment of contemporary culture we may raise into relief four key words: security, unity, freedom, and significance." The Christian answer to the demand for security is four-fold. The first answer is a realism which requires us "to reckon with the complex social

factors in terms of the meaning of history." (p. 137) God must be found in history. The Christian finds God in history. Jesus Christ is the center of history. "If we want to know what God means concretely for human history there in Jesus is our answer." (p. 138) But the Christian cannot "ascribe absolute truth to any of his own interpretations of Christ." ". . . humility and not pride is the clue to social security, for pride is detached and exploitative, and breaks down unity while humility is receptive and builds connections with the lives of others. (Where now is pride of race or nation?) It says that love is a better basis for community than mere justice. Justice seeks a balancing of the interests within a group but tends always to fall into a legalism in which the interests are defined once for all, while love is perpetually seeking to discover the growing interests in the lives of growing persons and to anticipate them. (Where now is the legalism which is the course of diplomacy and the persistent barrier to redistribution of power and rights in the international scene?) It says, further, that because men turn away in selfishness and pride from the demands of love, the Christian way is fraught with suffering and sacrifice, for the reconciling act cannot be performed in a corrupt world without inviting danger to one's self and one's group. This is the terrible demand of Christ, and men rise in protest against the 'foolishness' of it. The only alternative is a struggle to wrest from the favored few that which the many need; and the result of this is domestic bloody revolution or international war, or an incalculable global conflict among the races of the earth. In this bloodiest of all the centuries of human history we surely cannot pride ourselves on the realism of our secular political thinking! Why should we not consider the realism of Christian thought?" (p. 139) We have quoted Professor Aubrey at length with the purpose of showing a fine mind busying itself in escaping its own conclusions. It reminds one of the story of the Quaker, who came home from a visit with Hitler and said that he had made a "spiritual dent" in the Fuehrer. Professor Aubrey says that men rise in protest against the foolishness of the terrible demand of Christ but Professor Aubrey knows that no men will ever rise in protest against the foolishness of Professor Aubrey's *expression* of Christ's demand. This because instead of exposing love as the basis or core of justice he contrasts love with justice as a better basis for community, as if love and justice could be separated from each other. He confuses justice with law which is only one attempt to express justice. In making love and justice compete as bases for community Professor Aubrey divorces the two, sterilizing justice and turning love into the platonic onanism which is the curse which runs through the thinking of all these theologians. "The Kingdom of God," says Professor Aubrey, "is not a Roman Empire, nor a feudal order, nor a bourgeois society, nor a communist regime. It stands beyond them all and judges them, but it also points a way." (p. 140) What way? The entire paragraph in which this statement occurs is murky beyond description. As a road direction it is no better than a weather vane.

It is strange that Professor Aubrey in other sections of his chapter uses expressions which are sharply corrective of his own position. But whenever he comes down into the world he manages to lose himself. For instance, speaking of the tragedy of our American racial situation he says "Attitudes developed, and law enacted, at one stage in the development of the Negro are continued beyond their

usefulness. The law becomes unjust, because the definition of justice sought is now anachronistic; its creative character is lost, and law-abidingness becomes a travesty on justice." (p. 149) The "attitudes" and "law" he speaks of were only useful to slavery. They did not become unjust because of any anachronism. There was never anything creative about them. They were never anything but a travesty on justice.

THE PREDICAMENT OF PROFESSOR KNOX

The last chapter by John Knox deals with the Christian as an individual. Professor Knox speaks of the injustices of our social order and says that we must never "cease to be terribly, poignantly concerned about them." The Christian's moral "problem is created by his recognition, on the one hand, of the absolute truth of Jesus' ethical teachings, and, on the other, of his own inability to keep them." (p. 165) "This impracticability of an ethical ideal, in whose ultimate truth we cannot avoid feeling the fullest confidence constitutes the essential problem of Christian ethics." Professor Knox goes on to develop the meaning of this predicament which, if one can settle down into it, is after all rather comforting even although one must join in the cry, "Oh God, have mercy upon me, a sinner." "Sacrifices are called for, which we are unwilling to make and unable to make ourselves willing to make, and which, I believe one can reverently add, even the grace of God is unable to make us willing to make. God's grace can bring us to repentance and, in response to faith can wonderfully renew our will to righteousness; but perfect goodness in historical man is beyond even God's power to create. Only when His Kingdom shall have come shall His will be done perfectly on earth." (p. 169) Then what of Jesus? Was he not an historical man? Did he not say that the Kingdom is within us? Did he not pray that God's will be done on earth as in heaven? Was this prayer a blasphemy? We do not wish to accuse Professor Knox himself of blaspheming but Professor Knox in common with all the others who make up this symposium has offered nothing but a stone to the children of this day who cry for bread.

Is it not the gospel truth that Jesus broke the power of sin? Was Jesus mocking God when he said to his friends "Be ye perfect"?

The trouble with many of our Christian thinkers today (and here we do not refer specifically to the authors of this book) is that whereas the fingers of their conscience are beautifully manicured, the heart of their conscience is hard as a rock. They strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. We have seen rough men perform deeds in which during the moment of their deed they won through to reality. These deeds were perfect deeds. They were not polished performances, but they touched reality. The beholder who was sensitive to reality sensed that here was an action that in a profound sense meshed its gears into cosmic gears. Millions of such actions have been performed during this war by scientists, soldiers, sailors and marines, not to speak of sacrificial workers on the many fronts against that bestiality which has been launched upon the world under the tragic auspices and sponsorship of the name of Christ. The men who have written this book are, sad to say, lending His name once more to another holocaust now being prepared against the Soviet Union.

NO WARMING WORD

A Bolshevik once said that his movement would lose power when they lost touch with the people. A Christian might say the same of Christianity.

The Christian Church has been losing touch with the people and with God ever since it painted its cross on an Emperor's flag. It has lived in the bowels of empire, but it is dead in the hearts of the people. Never was it so dead as in this little book. For here, if anywhere in Christendom, we might expect some warming word, some word of understanding for the power which is breaking the age-old world-system of wage-slavery. We do not equate any power or any political system with utopia or say one word against the independent sovereignty of the prophet's responsibility to God alone. But Professor Tillich and his friends while insisting on this responsibility *in form* betray it *in substance*. The Lutheran dichotomy of faith and works still misleads these moderns. Faith and works are one. *By their fruits* judge the Soviets and the Chinese Communists. Professor Tillich likes to judge by faces. Faces are fruits too. All right, line up the cardinals beside the commissars and read their faces. Line up the Chinese Communists beside the gangsters of both China and Japan whom Christendom supports against them. Look at their faces to your heart's content, Professor Paul Tillich, and tell us which faces bear the imprint of faith and dignity and which bear the mark of cynicism and betrayal.

The perception of ultimate truth is a matter for gentle craftsmen and little children, who know that it can't be propositioned. Hints of it can be captured in a song or a fable but full-bodied it comes only by stealth, most unexpectedly, as a highwayman surprises a lonely traveller, in the very midst of life, often sweaty and sometimes bloody. No door, not even of bawdy house, can keep it out. No door marked with its name can bid it enter. Truth to a hungry child is a piece of bread and butter. Truth today, in the world of justice and brotherhood that struggles to be born, is that power which has consistently and effectively assisted its birth. That is the Soviet Power. To point this fact out is the urgent duty of prophet and seer, mystic and poet. To draw parallels between this power and the Beast of Berlin is to throw quicklime into the wide open eyes of children.

SPRINGFIELD DIVERSION

Review Editorial by BEN RICHARDSON

THE SPRINGFIELD PLAN. *By Alexander Alland and James Waterman Wise.* Viking. 137 pp. \$2.50

THE STORY OF THE SPRINGFIELD PLAN. *By Clarence I. Chatto and Alice L. Halligan.* Barnes and Noble. 201 pp. \$2.75.

AN UNPARALLELED wave of anti-Semitism is sweeping across America, leaving in its wake the battered and disfigured faces of Jewish children, pillaged Synagogues and terrified communities of Jewish people. The victims of this Gentile violence are without sanctuary. They despair of turning to the police for help. Too often they have found evidence of police consent and even complicity in the

outrages. But neither do they turn to Jewish defense agencies. They know that these agencies invariably deny the obvious anti-Semitism in the incidents and decry the complaining victims as alarmists.

These anti-Semitic outbursts are not isolated sporadic happenings. They are all part of a blueprint fascism has drawn for the post-war world. Fascism intends to capitalize on the consternation of the reconversion period to divide America. Racism is its most divisive weapon and anti-Semitism is its prime wedge. Gentiles and Jews know this.

During the months of August and September alone, the following anti-Semitic incidents took place in New York City, which bear out this contention.

On Tuesday, August 28, a gang of thirty Gentile youths in their late teens swarmed into the Brighton Beach section of Brooklyn, N. Y., and accosted six boys. Three of the six were Jewish. They asked the familiar question "Are you a Jew?" When the intended victim answered in the affirmative he was immediately set upon and viciously beaten. The three Gentiles were not molested.

On the night of September 7, the day on which the Jewish religion observes Rosh Hashonah (the New Year) Gentile youths broke into the Seashore Jewish Alliance Center on Neptune Avenue in Brooklyn, took out and burned prayer books used by the congregation in worship. A day later Gentile youths entered a Synagogue in Newburgh, N. Y., desecrated its sacred places, tore fixtures from the walls and did more than \$2,000 worth of damage to the edifice. Store windows in New York City were smeared with white paint and crude Stars of David were painted on doorways on the night of the Jewish observance of Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement).

In all instances the police, before and after making investigations, declared that the vandalism was "kid stuff" and should not be regarded seriously by members of the Jewish or Gentile community and above all it must not be considered anti-Semitism. Community representatives of Jewish defense agencies concurred in these opinions and amplified them further with detailed arguments for the absence of anti-Semitism in the incidents.

Despite these diversive and hush-hush attempts, THE PROTESTANT demanded police action in all cases brought to its attention and demanded that the obvious anti-Semitic implications be recognized.

This attempt to camouflage anti-Semitism and to divert the attention of the public from the mature fascist direction which brings it about is not restricted to the police and Jewish defense agencies. One of the most gigantic schemes to deceive the American public on the matter of solving inter-racial problems is found in the attempt to sell the Springfield Plan of public school education to the nation as the all-time end-all for racism.

The Springfield Plan, simply stated, is a program instituted in the public schools of Springfield, Mass., whereby democratic teachings are included in the curricula for all students in all grades throughout their public and high school careers. It has an adjunct which provides for similar democratic adult education. In this program the students are taught the appreciation of other races, their cultures and their contributions to American culture. The Springfield Plan is not unique. It has its counterpart in many elementary and high schools throughout the

country which make equally adequate provisions for democratic teachings.

High-pressured publicists outside of Springfield, however, have vaunted as a panacea for racial ills what originally was a quiet attempt on the part of the Springfield school system to improve its curricula. The school originally made no such claims for its program but recently its official representatives have joined in the great "selling" scheme and a recent publication by two of them explaining the Springfield Plan is now a vital part of the literature designed to achieve this end.

The major publicity agent for the Plan is The National Conference of Christians and Jews, who, although they had nothing to do with its inception, have since claimed credit for its origination.

The Springfield Plan has had little influence in solving the inter-racial problems of its own city.

Springfield has a population of 160,000 people. A partial breakdown of this figure shows there are roughly about 25,000 Irish Americans, 20,000 French Canadian Americans, 5,000 Negroes, 15,000 Italian Americans, 10,000 Polish Americans, 10,000 Jewish Americans, 5,000 Swedish Americans, 4,000 German Americans, 3,000 Greek Americans, and others.

A relatively high percentage of these people are foreign born or the offspring of foreign born. Approximately 55 per cent of the population is Roman Catholic. The remainder of the church-going people are distributed among the various denominations of Protestantism.

There is a great deal of anti-Semitism in Springfield. Anti-Semitic discrimination in industry, employment and housing is very prevalent. Some parts of the civic government are particularly noted for harboring markedly anti-Jewish attitudes.

Negroes are uniformly discriminated against in industry, civic government and housing. They are "ghettoed" into certain of the least desirable residential areas and are generally denied the basic privileges and conveniences of American citizens in hotels and other places.

The Plan does not work in Springfield schools either because two very divergent currents of education are operative in its public and parochial school systems. In regard to Jews specifically, the public schools teach the equal appreciation of all religions; the Roman Catholic schools, on the other hand, teach that Catholicism is the *only* religion and that Judaism is the direct antithesis of Catholicism. They believe further that Catholics must be preserved from having the purity of their faith corrupted by too much association with Jews. This fact is clearly presented as being the view of the Roman Catholic Church at all times by Father Arthur J. Riley, Ph.D., in a pamphlet entitled "Anti-Semitism" to which the Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, gave his imprimatur. Father Riley states on page 11 of his pamphlet:

"The position of the Catholic Church with regard to the Jews has been and still is that the Jewish religion, as existing, represents the direct antithesis of Catholicism. For that reason and for that reason alone She has striven to preserve Catholics from such contact with Jews as might cause harm to the purity of their Catholic faith."

Such teachings engender a negative attitude toward Jews, which soon finds translation in community violence.

I recently visited Springfield to investigate such an occurrence. The Kodimoh Synagogue and community center is located on Oakland Street, directly across from the Forest Park School, one of the show places of the Springfield Plan. I watched workmen dismantle eight of its stained glass windows. Their panes had been shattered by stones, "B B" shots and bottles thrown through the windows from the school lawn across the street. The workmen told me that this Synagogue is desecrated annually and that he had been one of the repair crews that replaced the windows for the last three years.

I made inquiries at the Jewish community center next door to the Synagogue. As I approached it I noticed its front door was riddled with "B B" buck shots. The lady in charge admitted that such vandalism had occurred many times before and that Jews were constantly molested, jeered at and even manhandled as they went to worship on the Sabbath. She said the police came only when called and that on the one occasion that they apprehended some of the culprits they merely reprimanded them and let them go. I learned from her that Jewish boys of the Center who use the gymnasium of the Protestant Methodist Church around the corner are frequently beaten by gangs of Gentiles who wait for them to come out of the gymnasium. Both the workmen and the official of the Jewish Center indicated that the culprits were children from the neighboring Holy Name Roman Catholic Parish School and Community House. This Kodimoh Center official, however, was quick to mitigate the anti-Semitic aspects of the incidents and was more reluctant than the workman to admit the identity of the perpetrators.

In the overall picture of democratic instruction the public schools of Springfield teach their children to believe in democracy. Its textbooks are selected with this purpose in mind. Springfield parochial schools, however, laud fascism. I quote from one of the most widely used textbooks in the Roman Catholic schools of Springfield, entitled "Church History" by the Rev. John A. Laux, M.A. Speaking of Spain and its fascist rebellion of 1936, the writer says (page 602):

"On the day of victory, Pope Pius XII sent this message to General Franco: 'Raising our hearts to God, we thank Him and your excellency for the desired victory of Catholic Spain and pray that this beloved country, having found peace, may renew with vigor her ancient Christian traditions which made her so great. With these sentiments we send your excellency and the whole Spanish people our Apostolic blessing.'"

Such teaching constitutes an espousal of the fascism against which the Allies fought.

Clerical Fascism at the children's level is one of the main sources of overt anti-Semitism. The Springfield Plan and those who sponsor it must face the fact that unless parochial schools, i. e., Roman Catholic schools, are included, no plan of racial amelioration in education can succeed. This inclusion must not be transient or superficial. Parallel programs of democratic education must govern both school systems. National and state departments of education require Roman Catholic schools to comply with the *academic* standards of public schools; therefore, the Board of Education in a given community must require Roman Catholic schools to comply with *moral* standards also. This is not the case in Springfield. In a book of

photographs and accompanying text, entitled "The Springfield Plan," by Alexander Alland and James Waterman Wise, Mr. Wise, who wrote the text, says: (p. 64)

"The parochial schools do not of course come under direct influence of the Springfield Plan. Nor are the techniques of education for democracy explained in these pages, generally in practice there."

In this present period when anti-Semitism is rife throughout the country and when every ounce of liberal energy should be concentrated upon this emergency problem, the projection of the Springfield Plan *as a solution of this emergency problem*, by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is—because it provides a convenient veil behind which fascism operates—part and parcel of the over all pattern of fascism in America.

HONESTY IN YOUR FACTS, PLEASE, CONGRESSMAN JUDD

Editorial by J. SPENCER KENNARD Jr.

The words of Quentin Reynolds, war correspondent, "It is now plain that more lies have been told about the Soviet Union in the last twenty years than about any other nation," bid fair to be repeated of Communist China. The tragedy is the greater when the disseminator of false information is one whom we Protestant missionaries in China have honored as one of our own number.

Congressman Walter H. Judd lived from 1925 to 1931 and from 1934 to 1938 as a medical missionary in China. But his speech reproduced in *Time* of last June 18 shows an amazing ignorance of what has been happening in China during the Sino-Japanese war. Its bias against the Chinese Communists, however much it may or may not have been justified during the period when he lived in China, is unjust today. In view of my own article presenting the opposite viewpoint in *THE PROTESTANT* last February, a rejoinder seems called for.

A review of Congressman Judd's speech, just received from China, is the source for many of the following facts. Others are from my own experience as a Protestant missionary until last year in Kuomintang areas throughout the whole of the Sino-Japanese war. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek refused the request I made of him to visit the Communist areas. The only missionary officially permitted to go there was a representative of the Vatican named Father Cormac Shanahan who, on behalf of the Chungking Ministry of "Information" has been editing an anti-Communist propaganda sheet for American troops in China. However, four of my Protestant missionary friends, as well as a banker acquaintance, did manage by devious means to penetrate the news embargo on the Communist areas and thus to obtain information in which I place complete confidence.

Congressman Judd states: "The Japanese have been within 100 miles of the Communist capital, Yen-an, for just over seven years and have not made a single major effort to get that Communist capital. I wish somebody would explain that." His inference is that the Japanese and Communists are in secret alliance. But actually, Yen-an is the only city in all of China which the Japanese obliterated. Unable

to reach it by land, on account of the well-guarded crossings of the Yellow River, they assaulted it by air. Not one building survived their meticulous pattern bombing. A beautiful porcelain idol, among my own cherished possessions, now in our West China University museum, is about all that survived from the thousand year old Tang Dynasty temple built of heavy masonry. What has gone since by the name of Yen-an has been the many hundreds of caves in the surrounding hills and recent structures erected on the ruins.

Mr. Judd alleges that the Communist armies have been doing little fighting. But the extent of the service which they have rendered our American nation, and at the time when we needed it most, is indicated by the fact that during the first half of 1942 they resisted nine major Japanese offensives which deployed against their North China bases alone over 160,000 Japanese and puppet troops.

Though some of these operations were on a scale larger than anything happening on Kuomintang fronts, Chungking censorship prevented all information from reaching the outside world. From the daily newspaper which I published in Chengtu I myself have been repeatedly compelled to delete news items which made reference to engagements of the Communist armies. In such ways Chungking created the illusion that the Communists were not fighting.

We are told by Mr. Judd, "the definite answer to this argument that the Communists are doing most of the fighting can readily be determined from observing the behavior of the Japanese." Quite true. But why has he not taken the trouble to find out something about that Japanese behavior instead of parroting the propaganda handed him from Chungking? A study of the distribution of the Japanese forces in China seems to indicate that the only time when less than 50 per cent were concentrated against the Communists was during the major campaigns in South China during the summer of 1944. Where most of the fighting has been going on all these years can be determined from a study of the Japanese military communiques. Usually they distinguish between engagements against the Communists and those against Kuomintang armies.

The *Asahi Shimbun* of January 15, 1944, attempts a summary of the fighting up to that date. This leading Tokyo daily says: "The main enemy has been the Communist forces. Of the 15,000 engagements, 75 per cent have been against the Communist forces." (My breakdown would be 12,500 against the Communists and 2,500 against the troops of Generalissimo Chiang.) These figures seem to be restricted to Northern areas, or else to exclude lesser skirmishes. By inclusion of these small clashes, which although involving often only a platoon or a few squads have been the secret of Communist strategy, their engagements up to the beginning of this year have been reckoned at 15,120. That factor of the smallness of the encounters disposes of the jibes of Eastman and Powell in the June 1945 issue of *Readers Digest*. Lacking equipment and ammunition, the Communists have had to depend almost entirely on the ambushing and harassing of scattered detachments of the enemy. This strategy has been both the secret of their victories and the source of their ammunition. It is by such methods that during the first six months of this year they recovered 87,000 square kilometers of territory, inhabited by 13,800,000 persons and administered from fifty country sites.

Congressman Judd, supported by the *Readers Digest* writers, makes much of the enormous losses in the armies of Generalissimo Chiang. But when one has watched year by year the shocking treatment of these soldiers, the callous indifference to their sufferings, the almost total lack of medical care, and the plundering of their food and money allowances, he wonders less that so many have been lost by death and desertion than that a certain number survive.

Of losses on the battlefield, I told something of what happened in Central China last summer in the January 1945 issue of THE PROTESTANT. Deserted by their officers, who had been corrupted by local business ventures and trade with the enemy, great armies of coolie soldiers melted away at the approach of the Japanese. Not a few in Honan Province were killed by the peasants they had been ordered to pillage in the cruel tax collections during the previous year of famine. I am under the impression that about half a million of Chiang's soldiers were liquidated in this debacle.

And speaking of "losses," Mr. Judd should also have said something about that other half million soldiers, including fifty-seven or more generals, whom Generalissimo Chiang handed over to Japan with which to fight the Communists, and whom he has now recovered. But more about that elsewhere in this issue of THE PROTESTANT.

His argument about abandoning separate armies is the most pertinent, but the provision for disarmament must apply not only to the Communist forces but to those dominated by the Whampoa clique as well. Of all China's political cliques it is the one offering the greatest threat to American Far Eastern interests. Patterned in a German mould it is committed to the domination of China by feudal landlords and military chiefs as agents of monopoly finance capital: in short, to fascism. Its widespread organization controls all the principal so-called "legal" or "national" armies of China. Its chief spokesman is General Ho Ying-chin, deputed by Generalissimo Chiang to receive the Japanese surrender.

Mr. Judd is only partly correct when he says that the Communists never will be "willing to give up their separate armies." To give them up in the face of an entrenched Whampoa clique would indeed be, as he represents them as saying, to face destruction. But, on the other hand, they themselves have long urged that their armies along with the others be merged into a National Army under a genuine National Government. What they cannot be expected to do is to submit themselves unarmed to the mercy of a military clique which for the past eighteen years has bent its major efforts to their annihilation. Neither Mr. Judd nor any other red-blooded American would do so either.

Finally, Congressman Judd should realize that so far from Generalissimo Chiang being able to establish the democracy to which he is committed, his unchallenged military supremacy means the destruction of whatever democracy already exists. Right now he is willing to make any promises that will obtain American support. But what he really intends is set forth clearly in his book, *China's Destiny*. The social pattern which he advocates is that which prevailed in the "Golden Age" of the ancient Imperial system. Hence he looks for a revival of the authoritarian philosophy of Confucius. Nearly all of China's misfortunes he finds to have been caused

by the impact of Western powers. Among these misfortunes is the introduction into China of Western ideas of democracy. American "liberalism" together with Russian "Communism" he finds "unsuitable to the Chinese type of life and opposed to the spirit of Chinese culture" (chapter 5, page 3).

The much advertised "National Convention" has been surrounded with safeguards to assure no serious weakening of the power of the Generalissimo and his reactionary cliques. The so-called "delegates" were most of them handpicked by those same cliques before the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war, and the members of those cliques now dictating China's affairs will sit *ex officio*. The draft constitution to be voted on provides for a president and an executive with almost unlimited powers. The proposed Congress meets for one, and at the most two, months every three years.

We wonder why Mr. Judd withheld these facts from our own Congress and from our American people?

WORTH NOTING

The orientation of the Jesuit weekly America is clearly revealed once more in an editorial entitled "Give Austria A Chance," appearing in the August 11, 1945 number. Aroused by a report in the New York Times, by John MacCormac, that AMG's screening of public officials for Nazism "was now being supplemented by further combing to discover whether the candidates had been actively associated with the local form of Austrian fascism by which first former Chancellor Englebert Dollfuss and then former Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg sought to anticipate Nazism," America rushes to the defense of Austria's clerical fascists. It exclaims: "If this amazing travesty of history is really to be the basis for our Austrian policy, then God help the Austrians." Then it goes on to paint Austria's native, Vatican-inspired fascists as valiant anti-Nazis who may have followed a mistaken course in their efforts but who had no part in a totalitarian plot against Austria. "Under the best of circumstances," America concludes, "the future of Austria will be precarious. Without the assistance the followers of Dollfuss are prepared to give, it will be hopeless." Hopeless for clerical fascism, they mean.

No doubt America's editor has found new hope in the September 12 report of John MacCormac in the New York Times concerning the People's Party in Austria:

"This is the new organization formed to succeed the Christian Social party which fell into disrepute when former Chancellors Englebert Dollfuss and Kurt Schuschnigg successively used it to install—in the hope of obtaining Italy's help against Nazi Germany—a sort of clerical fascism in Austria.

"The new party was formed from the members of the former Christian Social party, of the Farmers party, of the workers' and clerks' organizations and of conservative elements in the Austrian underground movement. Last week it elected as its new leader Leopold Figl who heads the provincial government of Lower Austria and is State Secretary in the Renner Government."

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ANTI-SEMITISM

By JOSHUA BLOCH

Says Father Riley: "The position of the Catholic Church with regard to the Jews has been and still is that the Jewish religion, as existing, represents the direct antithesis and contradiction of Catholicism. For that reason alone she has striven to preserve Catholics from such contact with Jews as might cause harm to the purity of their Catholic faith."

MOTIVATED BY a desire to improve group relationships, Jewish defense agencies facilitated the holding of a Good Neighbor Conference in Revere, Mass. Clergymen representing Jews, Roman Catholics and Protestants in the Boston area met there in September, 1944, and discussed the causes and cures of anti-Semitism. The conference as a whole has been described as an experimental venture; its proceedings have not been made public and no evidence of good achieved is apparent today.

In a paper on "Anti-Semitism Prior to 1500" presented at that conference by the Rev. Dr. Arthur J. Riley, librarian of St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass., an effort was made to define anti-Semitism and to clarify the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church to the Jews and Judaism in the light of historical experience.

Normally members of the Roman Catholic clergy refrain from taking part in any interdenominational activities involving discussions with non-Catholics of differences in belief and religious practice. In matters where expediency renders cooperation unavoidable a lay member of the Church speaks and acts as a Roman Catholic but does not presume to do so as representing his Church. Often such a lay member of the Roman Catholic Church is actually a renegade Jew or a renegade Protestant. Father Riley's participation in the Good Neighbor Conference on anti-Semitism held in

Revere, Mass., is one of those rather unusual instances in which a competent spokesman for the Catholic Church was willing to meet with fellow-clergymen of other faiths and to take part in a frank and free discussion of a subject, quite delicate, but of timely interest.

Why this rare exception?

It seems that Father Riley did not come to the conference for the purpose of sharing in the effort to devise plans for the elimination of frequent, alas, altogether too frequent, manifestations of anti-Jewish acts in the Boston area and elsewhere. He was there in order to bring about "the elimination once and for all in the mind of each one here that the Catholic Church is responsible for modern anti-Semitism." Unfortunately his own contribution to the conference did not help much toward the attainment of this much desired end.

Father Riley spoke for his Church; no doubt with the approval of his ecclesiastical superiors. This is apparent not only from the tone and content of his paper but also from the fact that it was given widespread circulation through its appearance in many of the official publications of the Roman Catholic Church. Indeed, the printed text of the paper bears the approbation of the Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston. In fairness to Father Riley let it be stated that he had some misgivings as to the value of the conference and cau-

tioned "not to be over-optimistic of the possible success of this or any other conference devoted to a study of one isolated movement" [namely, anti-Semitism]. Like other spokesmen for his Church he, too, finds that the solution of the anti-Semitic problem today is closely linked with the struggle of the Roman Catholic Church against "other subversive social and religious trends" [namely, Communism].

It is, indeed, quite significant that of all the papers presented at that Good Neighbor Conference only the one by Father Riley was selected for publication and wide distribution. It appeared first in the *Pilot* (of September 9, 1944) the official organ of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston and was reprinted in part or in full in various other Roman Catholic periodicals. The *Catholic Digest* and the *Catholic Mind* republished its entire text and the Radio Replies Press of St. Paul, Minn., reprinted it in separate form giving it very wide distribution. It is rather extraordinary to find that editors of the Jewish press found Father Riley's paper entirely unavailable for republication in the columns of their periodicals even though it deals with a subject which so vitally concerns their readers and in spite of the fact that it was delivered at a conference arranged and financed by Jewish defense agencies.

A Defense of Catholic Practice

An examination of the content of Father Riley's paper enables one to understand why the Catholic press was so eager to give it wide publicity and why the Jewish press could not very well offer it to its readers. It is designed to serve more as an apology for the anti-Semitism so often revealed in the behavior of Roman Catholics than as an

objective study of the historical background of anti-Jewish manifestations today.

The Rev. Dr. Riley does not hesitate to repeat unfounded charges against the Jews, even justifying the reasons for them without in any way questioning their validity. He maintains that already in ancient Egypt the Hebrews were found to be disloyal and that the fear of their power and disloyalty caused the Egyptians to take measures "first of repression, then of oppression and finally of racial extermination." Is it therefore to be assumed that Hitler's Nazi Germany followed a historical pattern? The Assyrians found the Israelites rebellious and the Kingdom of Judah was overcome by the Babylonians "as the result of an unsuccessful rebellion." Even Titus caused open rebellion against the Romans on the part of the Jews to be quelled "in the period from 66 to 71 A.D."—i.e., the period in which the Jewish state in Palestine was brought to an end, the Temple in Jerusalem destroyed and its holy vessels and appurtenances carried away to Rome. You see all this was the result of Jewish rebellion. Don't these events serve well the effort to give historic support to the main thesis of the notorious forgeries known as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion?

Father Riley maintains that thereafter under the rule of the Romans the Jews were favorably treated. He is not unaware of the fact that under the rule of the Romans the Jews were required to abandon the practice of circumcision, to give up the study and reading of their Sacred Scriptures and to abolish the observance of the Sabbath. Moreover, he notes as important the fact that the Roman Empire did order the "abolition of Judaism as a religion and that it did

enforce an actual change of its essential worship throughout the duration of the Eastern and Western Empires by its refusal to allow the Temple to be rebuilt" and declares that "the Roman interference with religious activity of the Jews was prompted by Roman political purposes."

The spiritual life of the Jews was at stake. As in the days of the Maccabean uprising, they fought for their right to worship their God in accordance with the dictates of their conscience and in conformity with the traditions of their people, and they refused to yield one iota of their religious beliefs and practices. They fought for the preservation of the faith of their fathers.

Distortions of History

Father Riley is aware of all this and does not wish to overlook or minimize it, but he does not think of it as a religious struggle. He describes it as "the constant political rebellion which occurred on the part of the Jews for a full century." To overlook this fact or to minimize it "is to effect a grave distortion of the historical picture." Has not history on earlier occasions shown the Jews to have been rebellious? Fear of them prompted the ruler of Egypt "to accede to the exodus of this nation from within his borders." The Assyrians "transplanted them to Northern Mesopotamia and Western Persia." Moreover, in their rebellions against the Babylonians and Romans they were quite unsuccessful. Yes, they are a rebellious and stiff-necked people and Father Riley finds ample evidence of this fact in the experience of the Church with them. All the historic evidence he cites in support of the rebelliousness of the Jews

only demonstrates their loyalty to the God of Israel.

Incidentally, in order to establish his thesis that the Hebrews in Egypt, Israel and Judah, were a rebellious people Father Riley does not depend entirely on Scriptural authority. He conveniently resorts to the use of conclusions reached by higher critics, the rationalist expounders of the Old Testament; a practice not common in the Catholic Church. (By the way, Higher Criticism of the Bible was once described by Solomon Schechter as Higher Anti-Semitism). But Father Riley is extremely careful not to apply this practice to historical events recorded in the New Testament narrative. This is somewhat surprising since in the Roman Catholic Church both the Old and the New Testaments are accepted as equally divine and therefore sacred and absolutely truthful. He insists upon the truth of the Crucifixion story in the New Testament with which the Jews are so closely linked and denounces the findings of competent historians who, after careful study of all available evidence including the New Testament narrative, have been able to demonstrate conclusively that the Jews can not be blamed for it. These findings, says Father Riley, are "based upon a conglomeration of rationalistic interpretation and of apocryphal narratives of the trial and crucifixion of Christ." He contends that not to connect Jews with the crucifixion constitutes suppression of historical facts, a dangerous procedure leading to increased tension . . . whatever that may mean. Is it meant, perhaps, as a hint that that "historic" lie must stick or else. . . ?

One wonders why Father Riley confined his discussion of anti-Semitism to the year 1500. Is it because prior to that year the pattern of anti-Semitism was

already set or because the beginning of the sixteenth century saw the rise of Protestantism and placed the Roman Catholic Church in a position where it now had to justify its beliefs and practices? Thereafter the two camps of Christianity shared in the application of restrictive measures against the Jews. He is primarily concerned with absolving the Roman Catholic Church of all responsibility for the flourishing of anti-Semitism in the days when its own teachings motivated Christian acts. However, he can't overlook the fact that in many lands Roman Catholicism continued to dominate the lives and conduct of Christians without interruption even to our own days and that in those lands Jews are not always and altogether free of anti-Semitic treatment.

The Roman Catholic Position

Defining the term anti-Semitism in the words of Pope Pius XI as "hatred for the Jewish people," Father Riley maintains that it "arises from deep fear of the influence of the Jews . . . fear of their hostile political activities . . . fear of their usurious and crippling financial control; again it is fear of their open opposition to the established religious order; and yet again it is fear of the alleged Jewish enmity for Christianity." All these facets of anti-Semitic fears have had their frequent echo in the words of spokesmen of the Roman Catholic Church such as Father Charles E. Coughlin and his colleagues in the dioceses of Boston, Brooklyn and elsewhere. Such Roman Catholic spokesmen have been instrumental in the spread of calumnious accusations against the Jews without their ecclesiastical superiors doing anything to prevent them from indulging in this ugly practice. They and

their satellites in the so-called Christian Front and in other subversive circles carried on a persistent campaign against the Jews frequently accompanied by threats and acts of violence. In the slogans they used in their anti-Jewish propaganda the various unfounded anti-Semitic charges against the Jews were given vigorous expression and the opprobrium "Christ killer" was effectively employed. Strange, indeed, is the fact that unlike the Nazis they never attacked Jews who left the faith of their fathers and sought comfort in the bosom of the Church. One wonders whether their persistent campaign against the followers of the religious teachings of Judaism is, as Father Riley believes, "far from being a conflict between mutually opposed sects between whom no real choice can be made, the opposition is between a Church, guaranteed by God to be in full and complete possession of religious truth, and the Jewish faith which continues to reject the truths which have been divinely revealed." Need the struggle between two faiths, that is, between two theological systems of belief and practice, find expression in the persecution and oppression by the followers of the dominant one against those of the other? Does Christianity require it that those who are not within its fold be persistently persecuted? Indeed, the constant persecution and maltreatment of Jews by professing Christians constitute a serious reflection upon the integrity of the Church and its teachings.

Says Father Riley: "the position of the Catholic Church with regard to the Jews has been and still is that the Jewish religion, as existing, represents the direct antithesis and contradiction of Catholicism. For that reason and for that reason alone she has striven to preserve Catho-

lics from such contact with Jews as might cause harm to the purity of their Catholic faith." Maintaining that the Catholic Church was fully warranted in the application of harsh restrictive social and economic measures against the Jews, Father Riley says that "keeping in mind the Church's position, we see that the Church acted consistently in saying to the Jews, 'You are an alien in a completely Christian framework; if you stay it is on our terms; if you feel that your cultural development is impeded, you may either be baptized or leave; but these restrictives are for the safeguard of the majority and must be enforced.'" In the circumstances Father Riley does not hesitate to defend such measures as the barring of Jews from political, civil and professional positions and their exclusion from trades and business. He finds ways of justifying the laws requiring the wearing of the "Jew badge," the creation of the ghetto, the restriction in number, size and ornamentation of synagogues and a host of other like prohibitions. Curious, indeed, is Father Riley's contention that "the Jew was not pushed into the business [of money-lending] by the connivance of the Church to provide a solution to an economic problem, which she refused to allow her own members to settle." He endeavors to give the impression that whatever conflict arose between the Jew and his non-Jewish neighbor as a result of money-lending transactions "was inherently an economic conflict."

These and other measures taken by the Church and aimed at the Jews are characterized by Father Riley as "protective charity amid wise administrative procedures" which "has been the official tradition of the Church." Indeed, in all the

measures the Church adopted against the Jews, Father Riley finds the expression of a charitable attitude on the part of the papacy in the interest of the Jews. "We may safely conclude that the Papal restrictions, based on rational premises and charitably but firmly enforced were the best guarantee to the Jew of the immunity from violence and from degrading persecution and expulsion." A goodly number of the papal restrictions "charitably but firmly enforced" represent measures against the Jews in the carrying out of which the Inquisition was excessively active. Yet Father Riley never refers to the role which this infamous instrument of the Roman Catholic Church played in the persecution of the Jews. Indeed, even the mere mention of its name he studiously avoids.

Be Baptized or Be Damned

Father Riley, though confining his discussion of anti-Semitism to its manifestations prior to the year 1500 does not altogether neglect anti-Semitism as we have come to know it in our own day. It is based on hatred of the Jews as a race and aims to attain their complete elimination from society either by murder or expulsion or both. He is quite correct in insisting upon the claim that the official attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward the Jews has no connection with that aim. Certainly, no one today accuses the Roman Catholic Church of seeking the physical destruction of the Jewish people. It does wish to see the destruction of Judaism, the religion professed by Jews, since it looks upon it and upon those who profess it as being inimical to Christianity. Regarding Judaism as the antithesis of Christianity the Roman Catholic Church wishes Jews to abandon the teachings and practices of their faith

and embrace those which it advocates for their salvation.

Father Riley maintains, on behalf of his Church, that it "does not consider the Jew as inferior in himself, to the contrary; once baptized each Jewish convert is received into full fellowship and communion of faith, thereby proving the absence of any belief that there is an essential inferiority due solely to religion." Obviously, "full fellowship and communion of faith" is available only to those who have undergone baptism according to the Roman Catholic rite. In this circumstance, is not every inter-faith effort for the improvement of group relationship altogether futile? The establishment of amicable relationship is apparently not attainable unless it is to come through some other channels.

After all, one of the fundamental teachings of the Roman Catholic Church is the ultimate universal conversion of the Jews to Christianity. No brand of Christianity other than that which it advocates is valid with the Roman Catholic Church. Hence it seeks the hastening of the day when all Jews find their place in the Roman Catholic fold. Until then the Jews are told that the solution of their problem lies in conversion to the teachings and practices of the Roman Catholic Church or in the acceptance of an inferior social and economic status. The Catholic Church offers the Jews no other escape. Father Riley is very emphatic in maintaining that a false characterization of the Jewish religion by the Church never leads to anti-Semitism. Granted, for argument's sake, that this is so what about the false characterization of the Jewish people? To speak of them as "Christ killers," to charge them with innate disloyalty, with habitual rebelliousness against law and order, with being

usurers, with deliberately rejecting truth, as is so often done by Catholic spokesmen (e.g., Father Coughlin), certainly leads to the formation of an anti-Semitic attitude on the part of those who fall under the sway of such vicious and false charges. The mere fact that they are repeatedly uttered by men of the cloth and frequently discussed in organs controlled by the Church or by its spokesmen is sufficient to lend credence to them among the faithful and the gullible. They are the ones who give support to, and participate in, the activities such as were carried on in recent years by the members of the so-called Christian Front and their cohorts. There is good reason to assume that the recent desecrations of Jewish cemeteries and synagogues were perpetrated by people who are led and influenced by preachers and practitioners of hate. Such acts have not been subjected to vigorous denunciation by superior ecclesiastical authorities in the Roman Catholic Church.

An Implied Threat?

In the face of all this Father Riley has the temerity to state that the Catholic Church is in no way responsible for these modern manifestations of anti-Semitism. He is of the opinion that to charge it with that responsibility is sociologically dangerous and religiously it is suicidal, for it asks that either Roman Catholics be eliminated "because their Church is considered to be the precipitating factor of this social evil" or that "the question of the Messianic mission" be removed from controversy. "Either course of action but accentuates the very tension whence anti-Semitism springs." Far from settling the problem it will only lead to "the end of Judaism or else its endurance of a new and violent persecution." Do

these words contain an implied threat? If so the world ought to know about it. His assertion that many who "have in good faith accused the Catholic Church of causing and fomenting, perhaps unconsciously, the evil of anti-Semitism . . . have been misled by opponents of organized religion" is without merit. Jews are not alone in making this charge. Many a good Christian—member in good standing in a Protestant denomination—has not hesitated to make this accusation. Surely they can not be considered "opponents of organized religion." Nor can the few Jews who have acted likewise be so regarded. Whom then does Father Riley consider as "opponents of organized religion?" I venture to suspect that he has in mind the Communists but does not dare say so since he is fully aware of the fact that many a devoutly religious individual is counted among those who are generally described as Communists.

The only solution to the problem of anti-Semitism which Father Riley suggests is one which is not new and which some Jews have tried with bitter disappointment for themselves and for their descendants. His suggestion is conveyed in not altogether too cryptic language: "Good will born of true knowledge and zeal for cure can solve this problem. Under God, through God, with God, can God-fearing, God-loving men come to mutual love and agreement." Inasmuch as Father Riley insists again and again that "true knowledge" is in possession of no faith other than that professed by Roman Catholics, these words have only one meaning; they constitute an invitation to the Jews to abandon the faith of their fathers by embracing Catholicism. He therefore concludes his discussion of anti-Semitism with what is virtually a direct appeal for the conversion of the

Jews by citing Christ's prayer on the night before his death: "That they may be one, as Thou, Father in Me and I in Thee, that they may be one in Us," and with the statement that "with that prayer in my heart has this talk been prepared."

Offensive But Frank

Father Riley's paper is full of statements at once offensive and inaccurate. He is not unmindful of the possible effect his statements may have upon those who have listened to them or read them in print and he frankly states that "blunt statements have been made, perhaps in blunt fashion, not to offend, but to arouse people to the reality of the problem and to the importance of correct thinking in seeking a solution."

Whatever Father Riley's intentions, his blunt statements and the deliberate perversion of the implications of historic experiences revealed in his paper, are certainly bound to offend those who wish to cope with the problem of anti-Semitism as with other problems affecting the welfare of the human family on earth. They seek to do it in an honest and fair manner and in a desire to evolve a solution that will work for the good of all and for the hurt of none. He would solve the problem in one way only; enriching the Roman Catholic Church by adding to its ranks millions of converts from Judaism. The very means — most anti-Semitic in character—which throughout the centuries the Roman Catholic Church employed to attain this end he declares to have been applied for the protection of the Jews from molestation. Father Riley maintains that those Church measures which brought about oppression and mistreatment of Jews and Judaism and which can not be explained as beneficent for the Jews were essential for

the protection of the Catholics. The Church "has striven to preserve Catholics from such contact with Jews as might cause harm to the purity of their Catholic faith." To attain this end the Roman Catholic Church advocated the exclusion of Jews from political, civil and professional positions. Moreover, the frequent meddling of the Catholic Church with the practice of Jewish religious teachings and its concern with the destruction of Jewish religious books are all justified by Father Riley on the ground that "full freedom to non-believers [i.e., those who are not Roman Catholics] must be restricted when their activities interfere with Catholic worship or tend in some degree to contaminate Catholic truth."

Father Riley's paper is not without merit. It is the work of an honest man; a loyal member of the Roman Catholic priesthood. It is written with candidness though not without partiality. That is understandable. After all he spoke for

his Church and he was careful not to misrepresent it in the slightest degree. His frankness goes a long way in enabling one to understand how it is that in this day and in this land it is possible for men who occupy positions of leadership in the Catholic Church to rise and with ecclesiastical impunity preach hatred for those of other faiths even to the extent of defaming the very people in whose bosom the Church was nurtured. Father Riley has clearly shown that the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church to Jews and Judaism today is the same as it was in the Middle Ages and he made an honest effort to justify it. He left no misunderstanding.

What is not clearly understandable is the fact that the platform and the opportunity for the presentation of Father Riley's rather remarkable paper were provided by Jewish defense agencies and financed with funds derived from Jewish private and communal sources.

DEDICATION

*I stand and watch your sleeping face, my son,
And in your slumber find my own repose
Dismayed not by the work I leave undone
Nor troubled by the budding fruit that grows
Upon tomorrow's vine. For though I plan
To stretch time to a thin and breaking length
In self-pledged bondage to the needs of man
And hold to thirsty lips my cup of strength,
I shall not count the losses, nor complain
Of quiet gardens left behind, nor weep
Because I cannot hold you, if my gain
Creates for you and others yet asleep
A world from prejudice and hatred freed
With love of God and man its only creed.*

LEONARD HELIE

HUNGARY—BIRTH OF A NEW DEMOCRACY

By JOHN ROMAN

If the democratization of the country is proceeding at a surprisingly rapid pace today, it is due to advance planning—plus, of course, the very significant fact that, unlike the AMG in Italy and the British Tories in Greece, the Russians do not act as brakes on the upsurge of the people.

FOR THE FIRST TIME in its history the land of the Magyars has really taken the road to democracy.

The thousand-year history of this nation of about nine million is one long chain of autocracy. Hungarians were under the domination of the Turks and Austrians for many centuries. Bribed by the Hapsburgs, the Hungarian aristocracy became overseers for the Austro-Hungarian dual-monarchy which suppressed millions of Hungarian peasants, Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenians, and Croats.

The leader of the great Hungarian peasant rebellion of the sixteenth century was roasted alive on a sizzling hot iron throne; the leaders of the 1848 Revolution, headed by Louis Kossuth, either died in exile or were executed; and those who engineered the two revolutions in 1918-19 either lived in exile or died on the gallows.

Allied Midwives For Fascism

These previous attempts directed against the country's feudal economy and for the establishment of political liberties were put down by outside powers. The Revolution of 1848 was crushed with the military intervention of Czarist Russia; the Revolution of 1918-19 was stifled by the interference of British-French-American policy. As a matter of fact, Allied policy was midwife to Hungarian fascism, and this "fascist era" in Hungary dates from 1919.

Immediately after World War I, the

Austro-Hungarian monarchy of the House of Hapsburg collapsed. The Republic of Hungary was proclaimed, headed by Count Mihaly Karolyi. Karolyi's democratic government included liberal nationalists, progressive-liberals, peasants, and Social Democrats. It undertook social and land reforms. The Karolyi Government sought the support of France, Britain, and the United States. That support, however, was not forthcoming. The Karolyi regime was denounced as "Bolshevist." It collapsed, and was followed by a short-lived regime of Communists and Social Democrats, which was overthrown by Romanian and other forces. The Social Democrats attempted to set up a government, but Hitler's eventual ally, Nicholas Horthy, was already on the way to Budapest—a way prepared by the Allied commander, Franchet d'Esperayn, on orders of the Supreme Council in Paris. Food was used as a political weapon, and Herbert Hoover's relief policy consolidated the fascist forces in Hungary.

Technically the kingdom was restored—though without a king—and Nicholas Horthy received the title of Regent. Actually a quasi-fascist, pro-German military dictatorship was established with the former admiral of the Austro-Hungarian navy as its head. Nazi-like storm troopers, the "Awakening Magyars" of Tibor Eckhardt, were masters of the literally bloody streets of Budapest; racial

laws were enacted; an exceedingly efficient Gestapo, the *politikai rendőrség*, was organized long before the time of Mussolini and Hitler. In a formal sense the parliamentary system remained, but there was no universal suffrage by secret ballot, and all effective opposition was crushed. Some working-class organizations were permitted to exist, but workers had no right to strike and their leaders were persecuted. Suppressive treatment was meted out to peasant organizations. Thousands of persons were purged during the "White Terror" and consistent opponents of the regime were imprisoned and executed.

Allied policy, which aided the birth of Hungarian fascism, protected it with maternal devotion through its most critical years. The *Union of Democratic Control* pointed out, in one of its many studies of European affairs, that when the news of the White Terror reached the outside world, British officials saw fit to minimize it. The British High Commissioner, P. B. Hohler, the leader of the International Military Mission, Brig. Gen. R. N. Gorton, and Admiral Troubridge stated in an official report, March 1920: "There is nothing in the nature of terror in Hungary" — though Troubridge made some passing reference to the murder of the socialist editors, Bacso and Somogyi. He described fascist Horthy as "a strong character and a man of liberal tendencies." He called the Horthy government "a Christian government in a Christian country."

Horthy's Hungary was the first fruition of the "bulwark against Bolshevism" policy, and later the country under its fascist regime became a natural and willing ally of Nazism. Hungary furnished political, economic and military support to Nazism—and shared some of

the spoils, until the country itself was completely swallowed by the legions of Hitler.

The Beginning of Resistance

On the eve of World War II, the more-than-two-decades-old fascist regime had succeeded in liquidating the most courageous representatives of the Hungarian people. It had poisoned the country with ultra-nationalist fascist ideology. It had corrupted the intelligentsia and, strangely, even affected the outlook of the Jewish middle class. In spite of all this, however, a resistance movement emerged.

At a secret meeting held on Christmas Eve of 1942, the National Front of Independence was established by representatives of various anti-fascist political parties (Socialist, Communist, Small Landowners) including members of the Social Democratic, Christian Social Trade Unions and even a big industrialist. It was a loose coalition of leading personalities who foresaw the ultimate catastrophe toward which Hungary was headed. The anti-fascist front agreed on a platform of immediate cessation of the war against the Soviet Union and for all practical purposes demanded the application of the Atlantic Charter. The movement called for: land distribution to the peasants at the expense of the large estates; improvement of living conditions for the industrial workers; the end of German domination, and independence from the German economy; liquidation of all forms of fascism; the outlawing of anti-Semitic and racial laws; universal suffrage and the secret ballot; free press, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom of political organization. The National Front

of Independence topped it all, naturally, with a call for active resistance.

As a result, a program of sabotage and potential organized resistance began to take shape in Hungary, though it remained rather ineffectual and never approximated anything like the resistance in Yugoslavia, Greece, Italy or France. The Petofi Battalion, composed of Hungarian anti-fascists, did fight in the ranks of Tito's Yugoslav Army of Liberation and when Hitler's legions invaded Hungary to complete the domination of this Axis satellite, sporadic armed resistance was shown by the otherwise completely surprised regular army corps. A group of high army officers deserted to the Red Army when, after Horthy's last minute attempt to leave the sinking ship, he was replaced by the regime of Stojay, soon to be followed by the Arrow Cross gang of Ferenc Szalasi, the extreme Nazi-wing of Hungarian fascism. But the military liberation of the country, unlike that of Yugoslavia, Greece, Italy and France, was accomplished completely by the Red Army.

Thus the contribution of the Front of Independence was rather political than military. The Front of Independence cleared the air in advance, clarified the political issues facing the country, created a realistic program for the nation, and above all, succeeded in uniting the diversified anti-Nazi political parties which possessed mass following. If the democratization of the country is proceeding at a surprisingly rapid pace today, it is due to this advance planning—plus, of course, the very significant fact that, unlike the AMG in Italy and the British Tories in Greece, the Russians do not act as brakes on the upsurge of the people.

Russian policy in Hungary is characterized by non-interference in internal affairs on one hand, and strict enforcement of the armistice terms on the other.

New Government Arises

By December of last year, the military situation in the liberated territories was sufficiently stabilized to allow full play to all anti-Nazi forces without interference of any kind.

On the first day of December, the Independence Front held its first legal meeting in the city of Szeged. The main representation to the conference came from the three most influential political parties, which had established an underground working-unity in June 1944: the Social Democratic, the Communist, and the Small Landowners Party. In addition to the broad representation of trade unions and unaffiliated professional people, two new parties joined: the National Peasant Party and the Democratic Citizen's Party. The conference issued a manifesto calling for the immediate election of a Provisional National Assembly and the establishment of a Provisional Government opposed to the Nazi puppet-government of Ferenc Szalasi, which by this time had fled from Budapest to Sopron on the Austro-Hungarian border.

Delegates to the National Assembly, elected in the liberated territories between December 13 and 20, met in the historic city of Debrecen. By the 22nd of December the formation of the Provisional Government of Hungary was announced.

The "who's who" of the new government read like a fantasy in view of the political situation that had prevailed in the country: it was a coalition of Horthy's former army officers, Socialists, Communists, and representatives of the

Peasant and Small Landowners Parties. Cabinet posts were held by an industrialist and an aristocrat. It was difficult to view a coalition of this kind with other than critical eyes, unless one had assurance that some of these people had experienced a genuine change-of-heart. Here is an original list:

Prime Minister *Gen. Bela Miklos* is of the Hungarian nobility. He was chief of Regent Horthy's Military Office in 1942 and became Commander in Chief of the First Army in 1943. On October 16, 1944, he deserted to the Russians with his entire staff and issued a manifesto calling on the Hungarian Army to turn its arms against the Germans.

Dr. Ferenc Erdei, Minister of Home Affairs, is a scholar and publicist. He is of peasant origin and a member of the National Peasant Party.

Dr. John Gyongyosi, Minister of Foreign Affairs, is a teacher and journalist, member of the Small Landowners Party. *Imre Nagy*, Minister of Agriculture, is an iron maker by trade, and a leader of the Communist Party. *Ferenc Takacs*, Minister of Industry, is an industrialist without party affiliation. *Count Geza Teleki*, Minister of Education, is the son of former Prime Minister Count Paul Teleki. He is a geologist and a conservative without party affiliation. *Joseph Gabor*, Minister of Commerce, is the son of a worker's family, and a leader of the Communist Party. *Dr. Agoston Valentini*, Minister of Justice, is a lawyer, a leader of the Social Democratic Party, and was Mayor of Szeged after the liberation. *Dr. Erik Molnar*, Minister of People's Welfare, is a lawyer by profession; regarded as an outstanding socialist intellectual, he was active in the formation of the underground "Peace Party." *Dr. Istvan Vasari*, Minister of Finance,

is an authority on civic administration. A former mayor of Debrecen, he was forced to resign by Prime Minister Gombos in 1935. *Gen. John Voros*, received the post of Minister of Defense. He had been a high military official in the Horthy regime. Gen. Voros was arrested by the Gestapo for calling on the army to cease fighting against the Soviet Union.

A number of changes have taken place in the personnel of the cabinet since it was formed, but the basic composition of the government has not changed. The general elections scheduled for November 4 will not alter, I am sure, the coalition character of the Hungarian government, and there is every reason to believe that the outcome of the voting will stand the much debated scrutiny of British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, if it is possible for him to be objective.

After their formation, the Provisional National Assembly and the Provisional Government set to work immediately. Their performance was such that it dispelled whatever reservations were felt in Hungarian democratic circles abroad.

Undaunted By Desolation

Where the work of reconstruction had to start was told in the eyewitness account of an American officer attached to the Allied Control Commission, in a personal letter dated six months ago. He gave the following picture of conditions:

"We drove around in our own jeeps (in the city of Debrecen, birthplace of the Provisional Government). The railroad station is burned down. There is hardly a house intact on Piac Street. The picture is the same on Kossuth, Szechenyi, and on Peterfia. The Nagytemplom (big church) is also a victim of

flames . . . It would be easier to give an account of things not ravaged, but it would add up to near zero. The people, those who are still alive, carry what they possess on their backs. Some of them walk around in rags. There is little food—and what there is of it is extremely high-priced. Most of the livestock was driven away. The dollar is worth 150-160 *pengo*, which, unlike the lira in Italy, has value, but, unfortunately, there is nothing to buy. As to Jews, hardly any of them are left. They were carried off to Austria and Poland . . . Poverty is staring you in the face everywhere . . . Budapest also has its share of destruction. Its population recently was swelled by refugees. No one lives where he lived previously, there are hardly any houses left—only cellars. How can you find anybody under these circumstances? There is no telephone and the streets are covered with corpses. No one can imagine the conditions which exist here . . . ”

Against this serious background of desolation, a significant note of optimism and determination was sounded by Prime Minister Gen. Miklós as he took power. In a special interview cabled to the *Magyar Jovo* (a Hungarian language daily published in New York City) the Prime Minister outlined the orientation and tasks of his government. He stated: “We want to rid ourselves forever of German domination and seek a new political orientation. Our immediate objective is to cleanse the country of all remnants of fascism. We have already started this work . . . Szalasi bandits were condemned to death and executed. We shall carry out the agrarian reforms, the centuries-old dream of the Hungarian peasants, which in the past remained a promise. We shall bring a better future to the hitherto oppressed classes

. . . Above the ruins a new life will come . . . On its part the Government agrees to do everything within its power to fulfill its obligations.”

This, then, was the promise of the new regime. To what extent has it been implemented during the few months since the completion of liberation?

Anti-Fascist Hungary At Work

The country's semi-feudal economic foundation has been shattered with unbelievable speed. While the “integrity of private property” as a basis of the economic social structure is guaranteed by the new government, the huge feudal estates no longer exist: agrarian reform is practically complete as the millions of “landless beggars” (a term used in Hungarian sociological writings) have come into possession of the land.

The purging of fascists continues as death and prison sentences are meted out daily. All anti-Semitic and racial laws have been abolished and all fascist organizations have been disbanded. Freedom of anti-fascist political parties and of the trade unions is fully guaranteed. All these advances are further strengthened by the establishment of freedom of speech, religion and press.

All political parties publish their own official newspapers, which carry spot news in the sense that commercial newspapers do. I have read also a number of unaffiliated newspapers. If a comparison is desired, they come close to publications such as *PM*, the *New York Post*, or the *Nation*, except that thus far they indicate no reservation whatever in regard to the Soviet Union, which they seem to consider the liberator of the country whose “honorable and correct” conduct is clearly established. I found no counterpart of the *New York Journal-American*

or of the *Chicago Tribune*. But I did receive my first copy of a satirical weekly; the country is learning to smile.

The fact that the Germans dominated the political life with an iron hand, and bled white the country's economy and manpower, stands in graphic contrast with Russia's "hands-off" policy in politics and cooperation in the economic field. Russian wheat and Russian loans have been poured into Hungary.

The fear of Russia and the "red-baiting" which played such an important role in the rise and consolidation of Hungarian fascism is unquestionably on the way out. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Kalocs not long ago called on the Soviet occupational authorities to express the Church's gratitude for the goodwill and assistance it has received in the free practice of religion. The powerful Social Democratic and Communist Parties (bitter opponents in the past) have published a joint call for "unity of the working-class parties."

I see by the Budapest papers that Count Bela Teleki (President of the Erdely Party) has been arrested in Transylvania and brought to Budapest to stand trial; that the Abbazia Cafe is back in the hands of its former Jewish owner, and the recent pro-fascist Aryan "proprietor" is behind bars, implicated in denouncing someone to the Gestapo. These "minor" incidents as well as the major developments tell the story of the birth of this new democracy.

A difficult road lies ahead. Seventy per cent of Budapest, the capital city, is in varying states of ruin; forty per cent of the country's manufacturing industry is destroyed. It is estimated that it may take decades to overcome the destruction in agriculture.

Lt. Col. George S. Kovach, attached

to the Allied Military Commission, writes in a private letter (Aug. 27-45): "This country will see a horrible winter..."

The difficulties will be political as well as economic. Zoltan Tildy, leader of the Independent Small Landowners Party, and Victor Csornoki, the party's general secretary for the Budapest district, openly admit that many enemies of democratic reconstruction have sought refuge in their organization as well as in others.

Csornoki said recently: "We know very well that it is absolutely necessary to clear the road from enemies of our democratic rebirth... These elements have joined the democratic parties—but without truly becoming democrats themselves... We are of the opinion that our public life as well as the ranks of all parties must be cleansed of the agents of reaction—and those, who consciously or otherwise, serve the cause of reaction."

Reaction Finds American Echo

Current news out of Hungary indicates mounting opposition on the part of the reactionary forces which were stunned for a while and regarded the agrarian program as so much "campaign oratory." Such resistance within Hungary is faithfully echoed in the United States. The American agency of Horthyism, the pro-fascist top leaders of the American Hungarian Federation (see *THE PROTESTANT*, Sept. 1944), is engaged in a systematic campaign to poison American and Hungarian-American public opinion. It is trying to undermine support for the democratic Provisional Government, which it declares to be Russian and Communist-dominated.

But whatever the difficulties which lie ahead, Hungary is going democratic.

MURPHY'S BAVARIA BOOMERANGS

By ALBERT NORDEN

Many Bavarian Catholics are determined to accept the proposal of the Socialist-Communist bloc to form a common anti-fascist front.

ONE DARLAN was not enough, apparently, for Robert D. Murphy, who has proceeded to repeat his corrupt North African experiment in Germany. Having been the American Vice-Consul in Munich some twenty-five years ago, he is an old hand at Bavarian politics. With Col. Charles E. Keegan, now running for the New York City Council, he established a regime in Bavaria that quickly became an international scandal.

"Military expediency" was the excuse for using Vichy Admiral Jean Francois Darlan in ruling North Africa after the Allied invasion. No such expediency existed in Germany, where the Nazis were already vanquished. There was no excuse at all for AMG to build a Bavarian government of German royalists, anti-Semites and clerical fascists. There were and are thousands of anti-fascists, many of them just liberated from concentration camps. Many private reports tell us how the very friendly feelings of the latter toward the Americans changed to bitterness when they had to witness the reinstallation of the reactionaries.

This chapter of American policy could have only one end. Murphy's and Keegan's darlings turned out to be former Nazi high officials, or collaborators of Wehrmacht imperialists, or helpers of today's Nazi underground. By now most of the ministers have of necessity been ousted, and the infamous Bavarian Prime Minister, Fritz Schaeffer, has been replaced by a Social Democrat.

But even after the collapse of the reactionary government, its policy is still carried on in many parts of Bavaria.

Here are some hitherto unknown cases which should not be kept secret from the American public:

Some Unsavory Facts

In Ganghofen (Northern Bavaria) evacuated anti-fascists from other parts of Germany requested the dismissal of the secretary of the city administration, Schmidhuber, one of the fanatical local Nazi bigwigs. This fascist was not removed, but the complaining party was threatened with imprisonment and expulsion by the American representative of AMG.

In Eggenfelde, the American Captain Bangs ousted the new Social Democratic commandant of the police, Weber, and gave his job to First Lieutenant Suttner. This Suttner has been an SS leader. He ran through the streets of Eggenfelde, forcing the population, at the point of his revolver, to take down their white flags of surrender one day before the American troops arrived. On that very day he organized the blowing up of the Eggenfelde bridges, in order to delay the Americans. When the dismissed Social Democrat, Weber, supported by the population, protested against the appointment of the SS officer, the American authorities warned him that he would be arrested if he didn't stop his complaints.

In Traunstein, prominent Nazis have been called upon for work in the City Council and the administration.

The daughter of Nazi Reichsminister Frank, infamous butcher of Poland, and one of the highest-ranking war crim-

inals, was given a secretarial position with the American authorities in Wiessee. German anti-fascists felt it their duty to report the lady's background to the Americans, but she was nevertheless given the job. In the same town, not a few important functionaries of the Nazi Ministry of Economics are living in beautiful and spacious houses.

On July 29 newspapers all over the world reported the arrest of the notorious Nazi geopolitician, General Prof. Karl Haushofer, a member of Hitler's brain trust. On September 18, the newspapers announced that Haushofer had been released because of "high blood pressure and a weak heart." I have reliable information that Bavarian anti-fascists saw Haushofer walking about near his residence at Tegernsee, in full freedom, as early as the first days of August.

Immediately after the agreement of Potsdam, sixty outstanding Munich scientists, artists, and political personalities addressed a memorandum to the American Military Government requesting the legalization of the anti-fascist parties in Bavaria. But Schaeffer, Scharnagl (Mayor of Munich) and others of their ilk, and above all those powerful circles who back them, are trying desperately to prevent the anti-fascists from working in the open.

Inspired by Cardinal Faulhaber

It must be emphasized that though the Nazi underground is a serious threat, the reactionary "overground" is a far more serious danger just now. And here we deal with the politics of Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber. It was he who inspired the anti-democratic policy of the late Bavarian government. He advised the priests to prevent cooperation of Roman Catholic elements with the anti-fascists of the Left. He abuses his

high position in the Roman Catholic Church by making it a haven for Nazis. Charitable collections are taken up to support arrested Nazis.

Instructed by their hierarchy, not a few priests are agitating against the decision of Potsdam to remove all Nazis from public and private positions. They argue that the ousting of these Nazis would push Germany into the abyss of communism, that these functionaries are much too valuable to be unemployed, or to be used in clearing away the debris of the bombed cities. AMG is in possession of letters written by Faulhaber in behalf of important Nazis, asking protection for them.

That Roman Catholic bishops are trying to make their church an asylum for all German reaction is an acute danger, and plays into the hands of the Nazi underground and its very intensive propaganda of rumor. They are acting in the spirit of *The Brooklyn Tablet*, *The Monitor* of San Francisco, and the Roman Catholic German-language press in the USA, who are hoping for and inciting a bloody antagonism between Roman Catholics and Communists in Germany.

Awakening of German Catholics

I am happy to report that during past weeks German Catholics have begun to put up a remarkably strong resistance against such reactionary activities. In Eastern and Central Germany, millions of Roman Catholics are represented in the Four Party Coalition that extends from Communists to Liberals and Roman Catholics. The united trade unions in this region also count many Roman Catholics among their members, and their leadership, composed of men of all beliefs and from all parties, is working harmoniously.

This process is now spreading into the American zone of occupation. The well known Roman Catholic journalist, Wilhelm K. Gerst, editor-in-chief of the *Frankfurter Rundschau*, a newspaper published in the city which houses the headquarters of AMG, has just published an article under the heading, "I speak as a Catholic." Answering a letter "by a high-ranking ecclesiastic," who reproached him for collaborating with Socialist and Communist editors, Gerst makes a statement of far-reaching importance:

"As a Catholic I, as well as many other Catholics and Protestants, have found a common basis with Socialists and Communists on the following three points: (1) A common anti-fascist and anti-militaristic attitude; (2) A common and unconditional faith in democracy; (3) A joint demand for an economy directed exclusively toward the wellbeing of the people, without regard for capitalist interests.

"Those circles—Catholic as well as others—that are still infected by Nazi propaganda, won't agree with my point of view. But these people are not fit to shape the new Germany."

During recent weeks sharp differences within the former Bavarian People's Party, mass organization of South German Catholics, have come into the open. The reactionary policies of Schaeffer, Faulhaber and Scharnagl, who hope to split the Allies and are fighting the Left, have provoked a revolt in the ranks of their own followers. Many Bavarian Catholics are determined to accept the proposal of the Socialist-Communist bloc to form a common anti-fascist front.

It is by no means accidental that a number of prominent Roman Catholic anti-fascists signed the memorandum, mentioned above, asking for the legali-

zation of the anti-fascist parties. Among them was the well-known Father Rupert Mayer.

One does not need to be a prophet to predict a split in German Roman Catholicism if its reactionary leaders do not change their course. The trials of the Nazi terror have tempered a number of Roman Catholic leaders who abhor the opportunistic methods of the old Center and Bavarian People's Parties.

They will be encouraged by the attitude of many American officers and men, following the recent Frankfurt conference of senior officers of the American Military Government. It was at this conference that General Eisenhower overruled those colonels who were in favor of keeping the Nazis in office, because of their "capability and indispensability." Eisenhower's very strong emphasis on complete de-Nazification is a stimulus for many Americans throughout Bavaria to get rid of the Nazis and their accomplices, and was at the bottom of the collapse of the Schaeffer government. During August and September many of the younger American officers began ruthlessly to root out the fascists and to help the democratic elements. Their activity will earn them the hatred of German reaction but will, at the same time, earn the affection of the builders of the future Germany.

In the coming months, the fight between German reaction and German democrats, who at last are permitted to form their own parties, will sharpen considerably. It is good to know that besides the American cartelists in uniform conspiring against the progressive Germans there are also genuine American democrats, whose policy is bound to raise the prestige of the country of Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt.

LABOR AND UNPRETENTIOUS RELIGION

A Sermon by SVEND GODFREDSEN

[On Sunday, September 9, 1945, Mr. Svend Godfredsen, editor and educational director of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, C.I.O., delivered the Labor Day Address at the Essex Community Church, Chicago, the minister of which is the Rev. Thomas Kirkland Thompson. The following is a portion of the sermon.]

I AM ONE of those who hold that there is common ground between the deep, soul-stirring convictions of unpretentious religion and the aims and ideals of labor. There is, basically, common ground between labor and religion, though, sadly enough, not always between labor and church.

As one who once thought seriously of entering the ministry, let me say that the driving power of that desire was the hope that I would be able to help make men and women free, intellectually, spiritually and, it follows, economically. . . . My desire was not to have thought separated from action. Of my own free choice I turned down the ministry and with less choice went to work in one of the most important food industries of the nation—yet one of the lowest paid, the packing industry. I found there, among simple and honest and unpretentious workers of all creeds, races and colors and nationalities, an opportunity to apply in an organizational and social way the rule "do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

My experience is that the motives that drive men to lead labor, have, in their origins, been religiously fierce in an uncompromising faith that "an injury to one is an injury to all." . . . Only in the relentless struggle which that principle continually encounters in a world where "the bread of one is the death of another" have labor leaders occasionally become afflicted with the germ which

they themselves had set out to exterminate. Their numbers are few and the movement marches on!

I would pay my respects today to the millions of labor who are unsung throughout the world . . . to the unsung heroes of the production lines who made available the materials of war that there might be one more chance for democratic living in a free world! . . . In the mines, the shops, the factories, the fields and offices, everywhere men and women worked to produce that all might live—that there might be a new lease on life—that your children and my children might have a chance to build that world which we failed to build after the close of World War I.

I would pay tribute to these workers who today, having survived the production miracle of winning a global war, now ask of those who lead the nation: "If we could have full production and full employment in the days of war to win another chance for democracy then why can we not have full production and full employment as we go about the peaceful pursuit of living our democracy?"

I would salute these millions of workers who deep in their hearts know and believe that man's relationship toward God can best be expressed in man's humanity towards man—who know that that relationship is one and indivisible!

On this day I would plead for a better

understanding of labor's aims, for a true recognition of labor's essential function in supplying the needs of all, for an appreciation of labor's conviction that a man, that he might respect himself, must be paid a decent wage and I would ask that there be understanding of labor's larger vision, its world vision, that it is folly to talk of peace in the world if there is to be hunger or privation or want in any of its component parts.

And so today, when you read of labor's aims, of full employment, of 60 million jobs, of social security, of political action, of decent wages and working conditions, of decent race relations, of world trade and cooperation—of all these things, kindly remember that back of the program is labor's fundamental concern about a worker's right to be dignified in his job—the concern about a man living his life knowing that what he does is important to the scheme of things and that he is a part of the grandeur of living—part of the eternal quest of all men that they find a oneness in their relationship to the God of all things and to their equals and brothers, other men of all races and all creeds and all colors.

And as I speak to you today, not many years removed from the shop, and

representing here today 100,000 packinghouse workers throughout the United States and Canada—it comes to me that I know with an unshakable knowledge that they stand back of me in every word I have said—that I have voiced their deepest aspirations and that in the crucial days that may lie ahead they will be true to the basic aims and idealisms of labor and that as they think back to the great depression, to the violences which their spirits and bodies endured, they know that they are committed forever to fighting that no man shall again go hungry and begging and forlorn, that no families, no little children shall again suffer as they did then and that man's true worth is his self-realization of his part in the struggle for an ever-unfolding program of justice and sanity in an abundant world.

Labor thinks of a new world. There is no way back. Labor has a vision. It is religious and strong in its essence. Labor's vision sees the people emerging from a timeless and eternal struggle. Labor's vision sees them strong, sees them inherit the earth—sees them free, children of God, boundless in their capacities, generous in their productivity, neither of race, nor color, nor creed, but equals, destined to so live that they need not fear dying.

POLAND UPHOLDS RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

"The Polish government declares the concordat between the Polish republic and the Holy See as non-existing, because of its one-sided violations by the Holy See, by means of acts performed in the time of occupation and which are contrary to its stipulation.

"Taking into consideration that, contrary to the majority of states, the Holy See has not yet acknowledged the Polish Government of National Unity and that in consequence of this no normal diplomatic relations are being maintained between the Holy See and the Provisional Government of National Unity, the Polish government does not acknowledge officially the nomination of apostolic administrators effected by the Holy See on August 16, 1945."

FASCIST MASS IN RABAT

By SUZANNE MAURY

[During the latter part of the war many stories appeared in the press of the world telling of Roman Catholic resistance to fascism. Since the end of hostilities, this flood of propaganda has continued and perhaps increased. It is true that there are instances wherein Roman Catholic laymen and priests took leading roles in French resistance, and in opposition to fascism elsewhere, but there are also instances wherein laymen and priests and prelates of the Roman Church took the side of fascism. To arrive at the historical truth of the role of the Roman Catholic Church during the war, and in the critical years before the war, we must have both sides of the story. What is the story of Msgr. Dutoit, Bishop of Arras, who was detained by the French Government in October of 1944 for "collaboration"? Even more significant is the untold story of Cardinal Baudrillart of Paris who declared in 1941, after the fascist leader Doriot had left for the Eastern Front to fight against the allies of the United States: "I have always appreciated the generosity of the character of M. Doriot and now that he has left with the French soldiers in this supreme fight, giving all of himself, offering his life in the crusade which he has preached, one can only admire his acts and follow his example."

The story which follows is a documented account of the pro-fascist activity of a priest and of the support given him by his Church. Editorial note.]

EARLY ON THE MORNING of Bastille Day in 1944 in the Moroccan capital of Rabat a group of more than thirty Frenchmen and women gathered by appointment at the Cathedral of Saint Peter to attend a special mass for the soul of a Frenchman who had been killed on the Continent a few weeks previously. At this time the Allied armies in the West — with them the brave men of LeClerc—were sweeping the Germans toward the Rhine. Men of the Resistance were rising to hinder the retreat of the Germans. In Russia French aviators were helping the Soviet advance. In Italy also the rearmed French armies were fighting against the common enemy.

Which name from this endless list of allied and French heroes killed fighting against fascism had the canon of the Cathedral, Father Chauleur, honored

with a special mass on the great day of the French Revolution?

The name was Philippe Henriot, Vichy radio propagandist, pro-Nazi and traitor to France, executed by the men of the Resistance!

This deliberate affront to French patriotism was followed by the indictment and trial of thirty-one people, including Father Chauleur. Most of the accused admitted membership in such fascist groups as the Legion Francaise des Combattants, Doriot's P.P.F., and the storm-battalions of the Service d'Ordre de la Legion.

The arguments of their lawyers were centered around the contention that the ceremony had only a religious significance and no political meaning. Some insisted that they were merely friends of Henriot in the work of Catholic Action. Others had been led astray by wicked

propagandists. They had sworn allegiance to Vichy, aided the Germans, but look at their names: such good French names! Some had children at the front. Some had decorations for military valor.

As for the priest, was he not by definition a man of kindness, above all political considerations, interested solely in the salvation of souls? There was no explanation for the fact that Father Chaleur had a short while before refused to hold a mass for a French boy killed on the Italian front fighting the Germans. Wait, the priest said, and we will have a mass for all the boys. One cannot have a mass for each and every person. Henriot, the creature of Vichy, was in a special category. For him there was a special mass on Bastille Day!

All were good Catholics, who did not realize for a moment that it could be scandalous to attend a solemn mass on Bastille Day for the soul of a traitor executed by the patriots.

It is true that the incident took place on July 14, France's national holiday, but that was but coincidence and chance. Certainly no one intended to show his scorn for the Revolution and all its works. Thus their lawyers argued.

In October, 1944, the Court of Appeals handed down its decision. The six women were acquitted on the grounds that they were merely accompanying their husbands. Five of the men were acquitted. The other twenty received sentences ranging from three to ten months in prison and suffered fines varying from two thousand to twelve thousand francs.

Now we come to the heart of the story, for it is more than a recital of a crime.

What was the attitude of the Church toward the priest and laymen who had

officiated at the pre-arranged mass for the traitor?

The Church took its official stand with the fascist friends of Philippe Henriot.

Monsignor Henri Vielle, Bishop of Thebes and Vicar Apostolic of Rabat, openly challenged the right of the French State to bring the priest into court. Father Chaleur was the canon of the Cathedral. He was the best-known priest in French Morocco, author of books and pamphlets and editor of the official monthly *Le Maroc Catholique*. When the State dared to take Father Chaleur into custody, Monsignor Vielle's first action was to close the doors of the Cathedral in protest and the doors remained closed for several weeks. When it became evident that the State intended to proceed with the trials, Msgr. Vielle published in his official weekly, *La Semaine Religieuse*, a mediocrally-worded challenge to the authorities in an effort to halt the trial of the priest.

Here are the words of the Vicar Apostolic, who receives his authority directly from the Pope.

"SANCTIONS

"We feel ourselves forced by the present circumstances to remind Catholics that all those who hail high dignitaries of the Church before civil courts without having beforehand obtained authorization of the Supreme Pontiff, incur, *ipso facto*, by the single fact of the perpetration of the crime, an excommunication of which the absolution is especially reserved for the Supreme Pontiff.

"We also recall to all Catholics that those who bring priests or members of monastic orders before the civil courts, without having obtained beforehand authorization from the proper ecclesiastical authorities, will be punished by the Or-

5^{me} année

20 Août 1944

N° 116

Publication semi-mensuelle

LA SEMAINE RELIGIEUSE

SANCTIONS

Nous nous sentons pressé par les circonstances actuelles de rappeler aux catholiques que tous ceux qui traduisent devant les tribunaux civils les cardinaux, l'Evêque ordinaire du lieu, sans en avoir, au préalable, obtenu l'autorisation du Souverain Pontife, encourent « ipso facto », par le seul fait de la perpétration du délit une excommunication dont l'absolution est spécialement réservée au Souverain Pontife.

Nous rappelons également à tous les catholiques que tous ceux qui traduisent des prêtres ou des religieux devant les tribunaux civils, sans en avoir obtenu au préalable, l'autorisation des autorités ecclésiastiques compétentes, doivent être punis par l'ordinaire du lieu, selon la gravité de la faute.

En outre, vu les circonstances particulières et extrêmement graves dans lesquelles nous nous trouvons actuellement, en vertu de notre autorité, Nous statuons et Nous déclarons que tous ceux qui, spontanément et sans contrainte morale grave, vont dénoncer des prêtres ou des religieux aux autorités civiles, ou bien, publient dans les journaux, les revues ou autres périodiques ou sur de simples feuilles volantes, des lettres ou des articles injurieux envers les autorités ecclésiastiques, ou même des articles qui, vu les circonstances actuelles, sont de nature à porter un préjudice grave aux autorités ecclésiastiques elles-mêmes ou à l'exercice normal de leurs pouvoirs spirituels, encourront « ipso facto », c'est-à-dire par le fait même de la perpétration du délit, les peines suivantes :

1) La privation des Sacrements ; 2) La privation de la sépulture ecclésiastique en tant qu'ils seront considérés comme pécheurs publics à cause du scandale donné.

Si des personnes encouraient ces peines, elles en seraient affectées jusqu'à ce qu'elles aient manifesté un sincère repentir du délit commis et qu'elles en aient obtenu l'absolution qui est réservée au Vicaire apostolique et à ses délégués.

Ce décret sera lu dans toutes les églises et chapelles du vicariat le dimanche qui suivra sa réception.

Rabat, le 8 août 1944

+ HENRI VIELLE, Evêque de Thèbes,
Vicaire apostolique de Rabat.

FACSIMILE OF BISHOP VIELLE'S CHALLENGE

dinary-in-Charge according to the gravity of the fault.

"Moreover, given the particular and extremely grave circumstances in which we find ourselves at this time, by virtue of our authority, We decree and We declare that all those who, spontaneously and without grave moral constraint, denounce priests and religious to the civil authorities, or publish in the press, reviews or other periodicals or in simple handbills, any injurious letters or articles about the ecclesiastical authorities, or even articles which, given the present circumstances, are of such nature as to damage the ecclesiastical authorities themselves or the normal exercise of their spiritual powers, incur, *ipso facto*, that is to say by the very fact of the perpetration of the crime, the following punishments:

- "1) Deprivation of the sacraments;
- 2) Deprivation of ecclesiastical burial

inasmuch as they shall be considered public sinners because of the scandal caused.

"If anyone incurs these punishments, he shall bear them until he has manifested his sincere repentance for the crime committed, and has obtained absolution reserved for the Vicar Apostolic and his delegates.

"This decree shall be read in all the churches and chapels of the Vicarage on the Sunday following its reception.

"Rabat, August 8, 1944

"Henri Vielle, Bishop of Thebes
"Vicar Apostolic of Rabat."

The threats of the Vicar Apostolic failed to prevent the trial of Father Chauleur who received one of the maximum penalties given out by the Court of Appeals: ten months in prison. After serving his sentence Father Chauleur left Morocco and is now teaching in a Jesuit school in Brittany.

SECTARIANISM IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Sermon by KARL BAEHR

(The Rev. Karl Baebr, pastor of the United Congregational Church in Chicago and a member of the Chicago Action Committee of THE PROTESTANT, recently appeared on the witness stand in the suit of Mrs. Vashti McCullum against the Champaign, Illinois, Board of Education to halt the program of released time from public schools for religious instruction. He supported Mrs. McCullum and testified against the program. Since then he has received much condemnation, even ministers and religious people assuming that he was opposed to religious instruction and was actually an atheist. Consequently he preached the sermon on the matter, which follows.)

MANY METHODS have been used to pass on the religious heritage. Throughout the ages these precious traditions have been nurtured in the home, passing down from parent to child by word of mouth and by example. Religious truth has been kept be-

fore the people of proclamations of leaders, as in the time of Moses and Joshua, and by exhortations of prophets. It has been passed on through evangelism, preaching, and teaching. During the early Christian era every Christian became a witness for his faith. He wit-

nessed to it while he talked to non-believers, when he was burned as a torch in the arena, and when he was thrown to the lions. When the Roman government became Christian (formally, at least), this method was displaced by that of compulsion. All other religions were outlawed, and people were forced to become baptized whether they wanted to or not. The Medieval period was similar. Fear and coercion were used to persuade the people to accept the heritage. The power of the state was in league with the church to compel compliance with church rules.

The Protestant Reformation ushered in a great change. The principle of the separation of church and state was initiated and rapidly promoted, especially in America. People were to have "freedom of religion." They were to have the privilege of being Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Mohammedan, or whatever they chose. And if they desired to embrace no faith at all, they were to be free to hold that point of view without fear of an inquisition. Consequently, in America, we have no "state church," and the people are permitted to follow the dictates of their consciences in the matter of religion.

The Case at Champaign

Because of the historic conflict over the principle of separation of church and state, there has developed a keen interest in the lawsuit of Mrs. Vashti McCullum against the Champaign, Illinois, Board of Education on account of its program of released time from the public schools for religious instruction. Mrs. McCullum, claiming to be a "rationalist" or "free-thinker," declares that the inclusion of sectarian religious instruction in the public schools is a

violation of the historic American principle of the separation of church and state.

There has been widespread misunderstanding of this case. The impression of many people has been that the issue is a struggle between theism and atheism—a question of which should be taught in the public schools. That error is quite understandable since the newspapers, in their usual search for the sensational, have given such prominence to the issue of belief or unbelief in the various miraculous stories of the Bible. However, the question before the bench there in Champaign is not whether atheism or theism should be taught. The issue is whether any sectarian instruction—that of Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Jehovah's Witnesses, Christian Scientists, or that of the atheists—should be included in the public school program.

Although in many homogeneous communities there is absolutely no conflict over the issue, actually the program of released time for religious instruction is a compromise between the state church idea and the concept of the separation of church and state. In the United States it is impossible for any one church to be accepted as the only true and legal church. So a compromise is developing: the state is using its influence—if not actual pressure—to teach any or all forms of religion in the schools on school time. Accepting that compromise, many church bodies and religious leaders have rallied behind the program. For one hour each week, children are released to the pastors or teachers of their particular faith for religious instruction. In some places this instruction is administered on school premises while in other districts, such as Chicago, the

children go to neighboring churches.

On the surface it appears that this is fair and just and that it doesn't violate the principles of religious freedom. However, many difficulties and injustices have arisen in actual practice.

1. While claiming to provide religious liberty to all, it actually does not. In many communities—perhaps most communities—there are more forms of religion than can be taught in the schools. For example, children of Jehovah's Witnesses can not attend classes in their own faith for two reasons: In the first place, there are usually not enough of them for it to pay to conduct a class. So, while in many communities their freedom of religion is theoretically unabridged, actually it has been violated because, since they are not in a position to avail themselves of the opportunity, their children have nothing to do while the other religious classes are in session. In the second place, in many localities they could not conduct classes in the faith of Jehovah's Witnesses anyway because of objections from the American Legion and other groups which have questioned their loyalty to America. In such cases, the religious freedom of one group has been dramatically abridged.

Other minority religious groups also have found it difficult to participate. The Unitarians, the Universalists, and, in many communities, the Jews have not been strong enough to take part in the program. Thus, while the system claims to abide by the principle of freedom of religion, it actually works to the advantage of the larger denominations and faiths and to the disadvantage of the smaller and less known religious bodies.

2. A further difficulty has resulted.

The program of released time for religious instruction has, in many instances, served to divide rather than unite the children. Minority groups, such as the Jews, have become conspicuous and tensions have been created. The public schools are perhaps our greatest melting-pot agency. It is there that the children should gain a consciousness of our oneness in a democratic culture.

3. A third negative factor is that no provision has been made for a creative program for those who do not attend classes in religion. Children tend to idle away their time. Thereby the minority not taking the religious classes is denied the civil right to receive maximum instruction during public school hours.

4. Out of the Champaign case has come another problem. If classes in religion shall be taught, then those who disbelieve should also be given the privilege in our free society to conduct classes in their particular beliefs. For example, Mrs. McCullum would like to have her children instructed in the various beliefs of all religions in order that they may use their minds in discovering for themselves the highest truth. She would not object to their being taught any and all of the Bible stories as long as they are not taught as something they must believe even though it may not agree with reason or scientific knowledge. She wants Bible stories to be taught as merely stories, or as stories teaching some religious principles that the ancient Hebrews were handing down to their children. Having met Mrs. McCullum and talked with her, I know she is a woman with high ideals who wants her children to make creative contributions to the world. She fears that they will not be free to explore their world, or free to make their best

contributions, if their minds are encumbered—or even enslaved—by ideas and stories that do not correspond with truth as they see it. Such a course, therefore, could rightfully be demanded by those who prefer a non-sectarian course in the religions of the world.

If released-time instruction in the public schools is not the answer to our desire to bring the truth of dynamic religion to the young of the land—what is? Is there some way we can do what Moses wanted done for the children of his day—give instruction in the code, that "children who do not know it may hear it, and learn to stand in awe of the Lord . . .?"

Neither Godless Nor Pagan

To begin with, I think it should be said that the democratic culture in which we are living is not atheistic nor pagan. There are those who declare that our society is becoming increasingly pagan and secular, and they charge the public schools with the responsibility for this development. They give that as a reason for taking part of public school time for sectarian religious instruction. With this type of thinking I must take issue. The public schools are not creating a godless society. On the contrary, they have been the greatest single agency in America for democratic training. They have, to a significant degree, given ideals to live by and visions of great tasks to be done. Such education cannot be described as "godless" or "pagan" unless education for democratic living—and democracy itself—is pagan. Democracy rests upon basic religious ideals: the

fundamental goodness of man, the sacredness of human personality, the equality of all men before God and before the state, and the earnest desire to build a just and abundant society for all.

Consider great passages from our democratic heritage, and see how permeated they are with references to God and with the desire for justice, freedom, and brotherhood.

To call this democratic heritage "godless" or "pagan" is far from accurate. That it is lacking in sectarian beliefs is, of course, true. But the great religious ideals of brotherhood, justice, freedom, and high purpose are there. It is for that reason that religious people have great faith in democracy's ability to create a better world for all men and nations.

This, then, leads to a partial solution for the problem of instructing our children in our great and godly heritage. I would favor the introduction into our public schools of a course on the moral and ethical foundations of our democratic society, to be taught to all children regardless of creed. Such non-sectarian instruction would make for unity. It would emphasize the universality of brotherhood and justice and serve to demonstrate that these are the common denominator of all faiths and denominations. And such a course would undergird the sacred foundations of our democratic society. Sectarian instruction must be given by the churches on other than public school time. Under such a procedure, paganism would certainly not win out in American society—nor would sectarian bigotry!

• • •

The last remaining Axis diplomat to the Holy See is Ambassador Ken Harada. The Japanese ambassador dares not leave Vatican City. If he did, he would be arrested immediately as an enemy of the Allies.

SOLUTION IN CHINA

By J. SPENCER KENNARD Jr.

There will be no civil war if America will mind her own business. Not daring to risk one without American aid, Generalissimo Chiang will be forced to compromise.

ALTHOUGH latest press reports tell of a degree of accord reached between Communist and Chungking leaders, America should be alerted to a sound policy of military neutrality in the event of a worsening of relations.

Thanks to their philosophy of "the middle way," their uncanny sense of when to compromise, and their longing for peace, the Chinese people will work out a solution, if foreign powers leave them to themselves.

The Communists today have even more reason for wanting peace than their Nationalist opponents. For eighteen years now they have known little but war. In the face of incredible hardships they have worked out a semblance of a stable economy in areas occupied by nearly a hundred million people and have been able to introduce local self-government along with many other social benefits. They have therefore far more reason for wishing to settle down in the enjoyment of those benefits than to embark upon a suicidal war that would jeopardize what they have gained. But they will fight to the last man if required to rely on the promises of the clique which dominates the military policy of the Nationalists. Known as the "Whampoa" clique, its past record seems to indicate that its supreme purpose is the extermination of the Communists.

On the other hand, that same Whampoa clique, in spite of its control over the leading armies of the Nationalist (Kuomintang) Party, is nevertheless not

strong enough to embark upon civil war unless assured of immense supplies from America. Those who, like Mr. Walter H. Judd and Mrs. Clare Luce of our House of Representatives, parrot the propaganda from Chungking deprecating the strength of the Communist armies had better familiarize themselves with the facts of their fighting against Japan these past eight years. Japan herself has admitted that they immobilized the greater part of her divisions in China. The Chinese Communists claim that they were fighting 320,000 out of the total of 580,000 Japanese troops assigned to the whole of China proper, to the exclusion of Manchuria where a far larger number were immobilized by the Russians. In the fighting, they claim to have lost 446,736 dead and wounded, as against 1,360,877 for our Japanese enemies and their puppets. The lesson from all this would seem to be that *if Japan could not liquidate the Communists neither can Generalissimo Chiang.*

But those who would like to see a fascist economy in China will retort that Chiang will be irresistible if America supplies an abundance of planes and tanks and big guns. However, they forget that Japan had all these things. And whatever gain Chiang would have in the modernity and quantity of American equipment would be offset by the inferiority of the morale of the greater part of his soldiers as compared to those of Japan.

They forget too that the Communist

armies withstood not only the finest armies that Japan could hurl against them, but also the forces which Generalissimo Chiang sent against them in collaboration with Japan. Besides diverting up to half a million of his best troops to blockade the Communist areas bordering "Free China" and thereby forcing the Communists to withhold added thousands of their own troops from the Japanese front, Chiang lent Japan powerful direct aid. Of Japan's 783,000 puppet Chinese soldiers stationed in China proper, Generalissimo Chiang supplied 491,000. The number of Kuomintang generals transferred from the pay-roll of Chungking to that of Tokyo numbered fifty-seven. In addition Chiang handed over the whole of his gestapo in the occupied cities. While he allowed General Tai Li, China's Himmler, to remain in Chungking, he is reported to have sent the trusted head of his personal body-guard, a German, to take charge in Shanghai under Japanese auspices.

Puppets Keep Their Jobs

Since V-J Day these traitor puppets have been transferred back to Generalissimo Chiang's own pay-roll. Their activity is to remain unchanged: namely fighting against the Communists. These are the so-called "Chinese underground," naively featured in recent press dispatches as coming out of hiding to greet American and Chinese paratroopers. In contrast to members of the European underground who fought so heroically against our enemies, these soldiers of Generalissimo Chiang fought in the pay of our enemies against those of our Far Eastern allies who were bearing the brunt of the resistance to Japan.

The man whom Generalissimo Chiang has appointed to be mayor of the im-

portant seaport of Tsingtao, Li Hsien-liang, commanded the imperial Japanese collaborationist army in that area. Wu Hua-wen, whom he has named as mayor of Tsinan, commanded Japan's puppet third front army in Shangtung province. And he selected for mayor of Peiping none other than the notorious Men Chih-chung who, in the pay of Japan as chairman of the puppet "pacification department" in Peiping, was responsible for the death of many hundreds of America's staunchest allies.

Does anyone imagine that men like these are going to bring about a stable peace in North China? If they do, it will be the peace of the graveyard, for aside from a handful of merchants and richer landlords, nearly the entire population of these areas has been mobilized under Communist leadership for vengeance against such collaborationists.

America has a stake in that vengeance. Let us not forget that the darkest days of the war for us were also the darkest days for our Chinese Communist allies. By the summer of 1942 Japan had been able to reconquer half of the areas they had liberated with a population of some fifty million persons. The slogan of Japan's armies was "Remove all, destroy all, kill all." But for that same indomitable spirit which sustained the defenders of Stalingrad, the Communist forces at that time would have been exterminated.

Few informed persons in China have doubted Japan's ultimate expulsion from the Asiatic mainland in the event of a decisive victory either for America and her allies or for Germany and her satellites because neither group could afford to see the vast natural resources and the immense population of China organized by Japan in a bid for world supremacy.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek banked upon America to do the job. Educated here, she loved America and the American "way of life." Her viewpoint dominated Chinese politics until the betrayal of western democracy by Neville Chamberlain at Munich in 1938. About the same time, Generalissimo Chiang's government retired to Chungking where, protected by a mountain barrier, he could await the outcome of the impending conflict in the West. Thereafter his armies never again seriously opposed the Japanese except on those occasions when they threatened the approaches to his inland fortress.

General Ho Bet On Hitler

Hitler's victory over France in 1940 was also the time of the victory of his sympathizers in Chungking over Madame Chiang. The cliques dominating the Kuomintang (not only the Whampoa military clique, but also the civilian "C-C" clique of the Chen brothers) were jubilant. Even though British pressure forced the removal of the last of Germany's military advisers in China, they were able to get rid of whatever Allied influence still remained over the policies of Generalissimo Chiang by ousting his confidential adviser, W. H. Donald. Those of us living in China at the time had long been aware of the deep resentment felt toward Donald by the Whampoa and C-C cliques, but we never learned till recently the specific issue which caused his dismissal. Mr. Donald has now disclosed that he was ousted because of his "vigorous opposition to the pro-Nazi policy of Generalissimo Chiang."

It is reported that before their departure the German military advisers of the Generalissimo gave him assurances

that they would be back again to assist him. Chiang's chief of staff, General Ho Ying-chin, who has figured in the news lately as receiving the Japanese surrender in China, revealed his hopes in this connection to a number of persons in 1942. It was at the time when Hitler's armies were storming their way into Stalingrad and had penetrated deep into the Caucasus. One of my friends was present when he told a number of persons in Chungking: "When his armies have reached our province of Sinkiang they will join up with us. Then, in due time, together we shall defeat Japan."

Here then is the solution to the paradox of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's resolute opposition to Japan in all his speeches, and yet his willingness to aid Japan at the time when we ourselves stood so near defeat. Either as the result of direct promises from Hitler through his representatives in China, Ambassador Trautmann and the German military advisers, or on the basis of encouraging gestures and his own reasoning, the Generalissimo was fully confident that Germany would in due time double-cross her Japanese ally. Moreover, as between a victory for Hitler and one for the United Nations, both his own political philosophy (as set forth in his book *China's Destiny*) and his consistent practice show that he favored that of Hitler.

An investigation is in order in this connection as to why it was that the Chungking government brought such strong pressure on our own to change the policy of providing aid to the Soviet Union for the defeat of Hitler to one of concentrating first on the defeat of Japan. The outcome of the war might have been very different had we listened to Generalissimo Chiang. A victorious

Germany, backed by the vast resources of Siberia, might today be knocking at the gates of Alaska.

The part that Russia might have in a protracted civil war in China has been uppermost in the thoughts of all who aspire to permanent friendship between our two great nations. Worries have now been set aside by the Sino-Soviet agreement. The Soviet Union is pledged to deal only with the official government of China. Therein she is following a consistent policy dating back to 1927 when the Trotskyist leanings of some of Russia's leaders threatened to embroil their country in a new world conflict. The policy is that "revolution is not an article of export." Hence there is little likelihood that Russia will abandon her strict neutrality. Indeed, many a Chinese Communist has owed his death to weapons manufactured by Russian Communists, which had been sold to Generalissimo Chiang.

Chiang Misused Lend-Lease

The question then arises as to where, if not from Russia, the Chinese Communists would obtain their weapons in the event that American military collaboration with Generalissimo Chiang meant that their opponents were well supplied. I put that question to Tung Pi-wu, Communist member of the Chinese delegation to the San Francisco Conference. He replied, "Our Communist armies will obtain them from America." When I expressed considerable surprise he assured me that already a nice advance assignment had been received as a present from good old Uncle Sam. Later I learned from another source that they consisted of a number of semi-automatic rifles manufactured by an American General Motors subsidiary in 1943,

most of them in the 400,000 series. They had been supplied with a considerably larger number of sub-machine guns, vintage of 1942, made by United Defense Supply Corporation of New Haven, with a wide range of numbering.

Mr. Tung explained that Uncle Sam, generous as he was, had not supplied them willingly. They were furnished to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, supposedly to be employed only in the war against Japan. Indeed the late President Roosevelt had made repeated demands that the Chungking government should guarantee to use any arms obtained under Lend-Lease only for fighting Japan. Our representatives in Chungking have given assurances that the Generalissimo received no supplies for purposes of civil war (see, for example, the article by General Wedemeyer in *Colliers*, June 28, 1945). And to cap it all, Generalissimo Chiang's chief of staff, Ho Ying-chin, stated to foreign press correspondents on June 26: "every single weapon in Lend-Lease supply given to China by the United States is used to fight Japan and not the Chinese Communist troops."

Regardless of all these assertions, the weapons in question were used for an attack upon Chinese Communist forces and were seized in the repulse of that attack.

During eighteen years of fighting, the Communist army in China has had to depend upon the ambushing of its enemies for its arms. By this time they have developed a highly skilled technique. Consequently they expect far less difficulty in getting weapons into their hands, should we adopt the stupid policy of furnishing them to Generalissimo Chiang, than they have had in getting them from the Japanese.

Morale Favors Communists

A further interesting detail was told me by Mr. Tung Pi-wu regarding Chinese Communist indifference to outside aid. He stressed that their most indispensable asset during the long period of conflict had not been money and guns but their own spirit of self-reliance. In the words of the "Internationale," which their soldiers sing going to their deaths, they scorn the condescending favors bestowed by others. The whole genius of their movement, he pointed out, is collective action by which victims of military or economic oppression solve their own problems. He said they had come a long way by their self-reliance; now they would finish the job in the same spirit.

In addition, their forces are substantial. At the close of Sino-Japanese hostilities they had approximately one million regular soldiers and more than two million peasant auxiliaries. To these must be added an unknown number of Manchurians whom it may be presumed the Russians have armed in the struggle against Japan. No one knows where Outer Mongolia would stand in event of a prolonged civil war that threatened her borders.

Although Generalissimo Chiang's forces are today several times greater than those of the Communists and given American support could expand almost endlessly, the decisive factor is not comparative numbers and equipment but one of morale. Most of his armies have seen only minor combat action. By contrast, the Communists are credited with 15,120 engagements which have steeled each little unit and made their armies some of the toughest to be found anywhere in the world. Above all, unlike the majority of Generalissimo

Chiang's soldiers, they know what they are fighting for.

Enlistment in the Communist armies is voluntary, only the fittest in body and fighting spirit being accepted. But in the parts of China with which I am familiar Generalissimo Chiang's recruiting agents operate a racket netting huge profits for themselves and useless soldiers for the army. Those inducted have either contributed too sparingly to purchase freedom from conscription or have such physical debility that they are of little value in the fields of their landlords. We saw them almost every day passing through the streets of our city, tied together with ropes around their wrists, like cattle going to the slaughter pens, sickly and dejected, utterly unfit for military service.

Their families suffer privation because the financial aid granted by the Chungking government is dissipated in the "squeeze" of corrupt officials. So many wives of soldiers have been driven to prostitution that the market is glutted. The petty officers who consort with them, having little to do because of inactivity of the armies, spend a large part of their time in gambling. As to the conscripts themselves, they are commonly treated like ants to be trodden under foot.

The Communists, for their part, have the sympathy of the great mass of the people, whereas Generalissimo Chiang's Kuomintang and provincial armies are usually deeply hated by the subjected masses. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether even the splendid Chinese forces built up at so much American effort for fighting Japan can be induced for long to fight their fellow Chinese. There is one thing the people of China want now above everything else, and

that is peace. The condition of that peace is not the laying down of arms by the various factions, since there is no truly national army representative of the Chinese people as a whole which can take charge of policing. Until there is, each ideology has to be able to appeal to arms as a means for enforcing its demands. Disarmament can only come after a democratically elected government undertakes the building of a new army which enjoys the confidence of the entire people.

Solution Begins In America

Thus we conclude that military assistance to Generalissimo Chiang would only serve to prolong the period of civil war. As that war dragged on the Communist armies would grow stronger, both by desertions from Generalissimo Chiang and by the building up of arsenals in the liberated areas of North China. To judge by their record in the earlier "Communist extermination campaigns" and in the Sino-Japanese war, they will never lay down their arms until China has a form of government in which they feel they can survive without them. And for this they will require a surer guarantee than promises.

There will be no civil war if America will mind her own business. Not daring to risk one without American aid, Generalissimo Chiang will be forced to com-

promise. Probably it will be much along the lines recommended by the Committee for a Democratic Policy Toward China, which will still leave the Generalissimo in supreme command and assure a good majority in the coming government to the Kuomintang.

Should we provoke civil war in China by pledging military supplies to Chiang, the conflict may drag on for a decade or two. Its outcome, as likely as not, would be an all-out Communism for the whole of China and a lasting hatred for America.

We would also lose a tremendous civilian trade. China can be one of America's best customers. Her five hundred million people are desperately in need of our products. Given a living standard such as both the democratic groups within the Kuomintang and the Communists aspire to, the people of China would be able to pay for immense imports from the U.S.A. Their raised standard of living would also remove them from the category of competitive "cheap Asiatic labor."

Thus our interests appear to be overwhelmingly on the side of those who would break the power of those cliques now dictating Chinese policy which have shown by their past record that they are the obstructors of a peaceful and democratic China.

AMERICANS AND RUSSIANS TIGHTEN THEIR BELTS

—The following is a portion of a radio talk delivered by Peter DeLima over KFWB, Los Angeles. The talk was sponsored by Benson's Stores.

SOME OF THE commentators and columnists who (notwithstanding these lay-offs in jobs in our factories) feel reasonably sure that their own positions are

secure, are deriding those who are apprehensive about the future, arguing that it is normal for us to have from six to eight millions out of work,

that we have grown great and strong as a nation because we have always had a certain surplus of labor; and that it is part of the American system to have it that way, and that we cannot have full employment without wrecking the very cornerstone of free private enterprise, without surrendering our individual liberties, and without accepting — with a cowardly surrender of our national best interests—something foreign and abominable, which they call Collectivism or Socialism.

Now, I am not going to attempt to argue the merits of so-called individualism as opposed to collectivism; but I would like to pass along a thought which occurred to me while reading recent reports to the effect that there may be from six to eight million of us out of work by the end of this year. If it be essential to the American System that we have five, six, seven or even eight million people constantly looking for jobs, and another five, six or seven million contented with a moderate existence pay-scale, then does it not seem that a certain number of millions of Americans must be sacrificed each year in order to make our system work, and in order to provide the rest of us with the advantages necessary for comfort and prosperity? In other words, some must starve for the benefit of others. Some must worry about how to get money to feed and clothe their families, provide them with small pleasures and advantages, worry how to get enough money for doctor bills when their wives and children are ill, so that our system can continue to flourish. If that's the way it should be, then I think we should state it courageously and openly, so that we will know the price some of us must pay in order that the majority of us may

prosper. I am quite sure that if it were put up to the people as a whole; that if our system as we operate it were honestly and clearly explained, there would be many who would be willing to accept the possible need for personal sacrifices in the interests or the well-being of the nation as a whole. But it seems odd to me that those, whose arguments indicate that we must have some who are sacrificed for the benefit of the rest of us, are the very ones who are most distressed over the individual sacrifices that are made by the people in some other countries for the sake of gaining the greatest possible measure of economic well-being for their countries as a whole.

For instance, when the people of Russia were told to tighten their belts so that Russia could successfully accomplish its five-year plans, there was much hue and cry in this country over the fact that millions of Russians were being starved and forced to make sacrifices so that Russia's system could be made to work. Do you see the point I am trying to make? It was indeed bad that some Russians had to be starved for the benefit of their system, but apparently quite all right that, roughly, about as many millions of Americans must go hungry for the benefit of ours. We are told that most of the Russians tightened their belts cheerfully, knowing that their sacrifices were being made for the benefit of people *like* themselves. Is it possible that those in our country who have been called upon to make sacrifices in the past, and who may be expected to make them again, have done so and will do so cheerfully and willingly, because such sacrifices will be for the benefit of people *not* like themselves — people who fortunately have what we politely refer to as "better advantages"?

A REVIEW OF VITAL LITERATURE

RELIGION TODAY IN THE U.S.S.R., *by Rev. William Howard Melish*; The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 114 East 32nd Street, New York 16, N. Y., 48 pp., 15 cents.

The history of organized religion in the Soviet Union is brought up to date in this well-documented pamphlet by the Associate Rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn.

The knowledge that Russian churchmen feel they are freer than those in other lands may, I hope, discourage some of those misled or malicious people who chant "Godless Russia" as they hug the ugly forms of feudalism and big business to their cross-bedecked bosoms. It may sober them to be reminded that when Hitler confidently appealed to the religious groups in the Soviet Union to aid his "holy crusade" he was soundly rebuffed by Orthodox, Evangelical, Jewish and Mohammedan loyalty to the Soviet government. It is also well to be reminded of the existence of a vast section of Christendom which considers the Roman Catholic Church to be a schismatic branch.

Of particular interest to the person sincerely concerned about the future of religious bodies is the fact that such organizations in the Soviet Union, in adapting themselves to a socialist economy in which they can no longer depend upon accumulated investments and state subsidies for income and upon control of education and charities for indoctrination and prestige, have developed a spiritual function of sufficient importance to assure their support by the voluntary giving of their members. They appear to have experienced a rebirth of inner moral and spiritual quality.

In a section discussing the question of the Roman Catholics in the Soviet Union,

Mr. Melish lays bare the economic and political reasons for the Vatican's unrelenting anti-Soviet campaign. As he says, the Vatican, as a reactionary economic and political organization, is "alarmed at the extension of three basic principles which now find expression in the U.S.S.R., namely: the socialization of property, the separation of church and state, and the separation of church and school." All three threaten the political power of Rome.

Mr. Melish does not say so, but I say that the practice of the three principles feared by the Vatican is one of the reasons for claiming that the Soviet Union represents a resurgence of Protestantism. Many people in Protestant circles do not see this, but the Vatican does and that is why, in its own peculiar language, it links the Reformation and the Russian Revolution as expressions of the spirit among men to which it is opposed.

Mr. Melish is primarily concerned with organized religion in the Soviet Union and has done an excellent piece of work on that subject. But at one or two points he makes statements which seem to reveal a narrow view of the way in which religion finds expression among men. I would not say, as he does, that "the leaders in the Kremlin are not religious men." I do not believe that God is incapable of reaching and moving men whose names are not found in the registers of traditional religious organizations. Be that as it may, the very fact that organized religion in the Soviet Union has

a simple worshipful and spiritual function because the State has undertaken the major responsibility for feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, and caring for widows and orphans, is an indication that the leaders of the Soviet Union would be judged religious by Jesus at least. Another indication is their clear appreciation of the moral weakness manifested in the racist practices of the Nazis which they considered an important factor contributing to the military defeat of Nazism.

I certainly agree with the conclusion reached by Mr. Melish: "The Soviet Union is not '*Godless*' nor is the United States *God's sole chosen people*. Both are His. They are meant to live each with the other."

J. M. FREEMAN

THE CHINESE LABOR MOVEMENT, by Nym Wales, The John Day Co., New York, 235 pp., \$2.75

This book by Nym Wales is claimed to be the first and only history of the labor movement in China, and is certainly the most extensive source of facts on the subject. It has special value for this reason, and also because of the widespread ignorance on the whole subject throughout the United States. Its worth, of course, is not in its literary style nor in its technical perfection, but in its information on Chinese trade unionism. The author gathered her material from the reading of the limited and not always too reliable materials on the subject, and from interviews with workers, labor leaders, and other students of Chinese trade unionism during her nine years in China, a significant portion of which was spent in the Communist-led Partisan area.

Stress is laid on the sudden, revolu-

tionary rise of labor in China in the period following the last war (as contrasted with the slower, more gradual development of trade unionism in more democratically stable lands). The author documents the traditionally ruthless exploitation of Chinese workers (including women and children), and shows how the extent of foreign economic domination made Chinese organized labor an important anti-imperialist force. Militant students made significant contributions to labor's first stirrings, and the first unions in the modern sense came in the early 1920's, their antecedents being guilds and workers' clubs. These beginnings were marked by astounding trade union growth and militant strikes, especially the successful Hong Kong seamen's strike and the railway strikes, which were initially successful, but were, in 1923, violently suppressed by militarists. This suppression drove most trade unions underground until they began a new period of rapid growth in 1925, under the blessing of Sun Yat-Sen and the Kuomintang. This period of trade union growth ended with the victory of rightist reaction in 1927, after which the Kuomintang government attacked free trade unions, which have been virtually non-existent in Kuomintang China since the beginning of the civil war, as Madame Sun Yat-Sen points out. Nym Wales proves that the so-called "unions" under the Kuomintang are fully controlled by the government.

These profoundly disturbing facts should not, however, lead to an attitude of final pessimism regarding the role of labor in China. It should be remembered and emphasized that the decline of labor in Kuomintang areas was the fruit of outside and violent suppression, and not of natural causes within the Chinese

labor movement as such. It should also not be forgotten that an unorganized labor movement has never ceased to continue to stir within Kuomintang areas. The existence and decisive contribution of democratically organized labor in Partisan China and the role of workers in Kuomintang China in the democratic

Indusco movement show what will happen throughout the nation when the desperately needed democratization of Chungking at last takes place, and when democratic labor rights are recognized anew.

JACK R. McMICHAEL

BOOKS RECEIVED

- INSIDE ROME WITH THE GERMANS, by Jane Scrivener, MacMillan Company, 204 pp. \$2.50
- GOD IS NOT DEAD, by Bernard Iddings Bell, Harper & Bros., 185 pp. \$1.50
- LET'S TALK ABOUT THE PEACE, by Henry G. Alsberg, Hastings House, 324 pp. \$2.75
- A BOOK OF COMFORT, Compiled by Eric Parker, Harper & Bros., 320 pp. \$1.50
- HIS TERRIBLE SWIFT SWORD, by the Very Rev. Dr. Norman Maclean, Christian Council on Palestine, 126 pp. \$25
- ALL BRAVE SAILORS, by John Beecher, L. B. Fischer Publishing Corp., 208 pp. \$2.50
- MAKING THE GOSPEL EFFECTIVE, Edited by William K. Anderson, Commission on Ministerial Training, Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn. 221 pp.
- SOLDIER, YOU'RE IT!, by Ralph Waldo Nelson, Association Press, 132 pp. \$1.00
- A HISTORY OF UNITARIANISM, by Earl Morse Wilbur, Harvard University Press, 617 pp. \$6.00
- JEWISH FRONTIER, Anthology, Jewish Frontier Assn., 565 pp. \$2.00
- YOUNG MAN WITH A HORN, by Dorothy Baker, Penguin Books, 184 pp. \$.25
- DEATH OF A SABOTEUR, by Hulbert Footner, Penguin Books, 246 pp. \$.25
- THE TREATMENT OF DEFEATED GERMANY, by V. J. Jerome, New Century Publishers, 107 pp. \$.35
- NEWS FROM NORTH OF THE NILE, by Paul Harris, Jr., Association Press, 109 pp. \$1.50
- FRANCESCA CABRINI, by Lucille Papin Borden, MacMillan Company, 402 pp., \$2.75
- THE LORD'S SUPPER IN PROTESTANTISM, by Elmer S. Freeman, MacMillan Company, 174 pp. \$1.75
- THE DOCTOR'S JOB, by Carl Binger, M. D., W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 243 pp. \$3.00
- THAT BOY NIKOLKA, by Ruth E. Kennell, Russian War Relief, Inc., 67 pp., \$.25
- BIBLE MUSIC, by Lulu Rumsey Wiley, The Paebear Company, 218 pp. \$3.00
- THE MAN MOSES, by Frank C. Pinkerton, The Paebear Company, 132 pp. \$2.00
- THE CHINESE LABOR MOVEMENT, by Nym Wales, John Day Company, 235 pp. \$2.75
- THE FAITH OF MAN SPEAKS, Edited by Helen Woodbury, MacMillan Company, 132 pp. \$1.75
- HEALING SYMPHONY, by Lloyd Frank Merrell, Banner Press, 112 pp. \$2.00
- LEVELLER MANIFESTOES OF THE PURITAN REVOLUTION, Edited by Don M. Wolfe, Foreword by Charles A. Beard, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 440 pp. \$5.00
- THEY FOUND THE CHURCH THERE, by Henry P. Van Dusen, Charles Scribner's Sons, 148 pp. \$1.75
- CHOIR AND TEMPEST, by Esther Fremont, Great-Concord Publishers, 149 pp. \$1.50 paper, \$2.00 cloth
- THE LEVELLER TRACTS, Edited by William Haller and Godfrey Davies, Columbia University Press in cooperation with Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 481 pp. \$6.50
- WORLD CULTURE, by Pryns Hopkins, Freedom Publications, 146 pp. \$.70

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

In the Spearhead of the New Protestantism

In response to your invitation to write you my reactions to your editorial in the June-July number of THE PROTESTANT let me say that I am heartily in sympathy with this emphasis in the new Protestantism.

For the past two years I have been lecturing here and there on the subject of Soviet Russia and have tried to correct many false and misleading statements made in the press and elsewhere against the government and people of Russia.

I am well aware of the whispering campaign now in progress that our next war is with Russia and we must get ready for it.

The Roman hierarchy is doing everything in its power through Polish and nationality groups to breed antagonism and the Congressional Record lends itself to that propaganda.

The Roman officials know full well that when economic and political democracy are once achieved, their power over the people will be greatly diminished.

Anti-Semitism is a spearhead. In our town there is only one Jewish family—the daughter a member of our church because I took an interest in this group and paved the way for them to get acquainted. This man, a merchant in our town, ran for alderman this year. He received seven votes and his opponent, over two hundred. If he had been a confirmed fascist he would have polled more votes than that.

This thing is very serious. I find the minds of church people definitely biased in favor of ideas which make fascism possible. I have been trying to do all in my poor power to cultivate a love of the truth based on facts, to encourage open and fair-mindedness, and I have spent much time reading and studying to keep myself informed. There has been some success along these lines.

I want to be included in the circle of the new Protestantism. I get Fifield's material and some comes from Peale in New York City. I suspected something in the very first pamphlet. No doubt NAM has something to do with it. Some pulpits are definitely closed to any who are not on the ballyhoo chorus of puppets for the rich who hold the purse-strings and control pulpit committees.

Clerical fascism is a sinister power, and of course it is not limited to Catholicism. Its features need to be pointed out, however, so it can be detected even if the devil has to be named on occasion.

More power to you, therefore. We have a big job on our hands and our opponents are mighty but if little David knows how to handle his weapons, the old giant might be brought low. Yours for real Christianity,

REV. C. HARRISON BECKER
Morrison, Illinois

Then Why Not Break With Franco?

I acknowledge the receipt, by reference from the White House, of your telegram of July 24 on behalf of the Ministerial Associates of THE PROTESTANT, in regard to the present Government of Spain.

Our current relations with the Spanish Government are conditioned by the basic

fact that, so long as the regime retains its present character, there can be no expectation either of cordial relations between Spain and the United States, or of constructive measures by us to assist Spain. Moreover, under these circumstances, Spain is unable to take her proper place in the community of nations. You will doubtless have noted in this connection the statement made by President Truman and the other heads of government at the Tripartite Conference of Berlin on August 2 that in view of its origins, its nature, its record and its close association with the aggressor states, the present Spanish Government was not considered eligible for membership in the United Nations Organization.

Thank you for making the views of your group available. You may be sure that such expressions of opinion are taken into consideration together with all other relevant factors in determining the specific development of policy.

For the Secretary of State:

J. M. COLTON HAND,

Chief, Public Views and Inquiries Section

Division of Public Liaison

Department of State, Washington

Sept. 4, 1945

"Military Vicar of the United States"?

In reply to your telegram of 20 August 1945 addressed to President Harry S. Truman regarding Archbishop Spellman, we beg to advise that the phrase "Military Vicar of the United States" is neither an Army nor a Navy title and therefore implies no delegation of authority from either.

The term "vicar" is used in both the Episcopal and Roman Catholic Churches to indicate one who exercises jurisdiction delegated by higher ecclesiastical authority.

"Military Vicars" are those who exercise spiritual jurisdiction over members of their respective churches in the armed forces of any country.

For and in the absence of the Chief of Chaplains:

A. S. GOODYEAR, *Colonel, A.G.D.,*

Executive Assistant, Army Service Forces

Office of Chief of Chaplains

Washington 25, D. C.

August 25, 1945

Objects to Roman Catholic on Our Staff

I have been notified that my subscription to THE PROTESTANT has expired, but I shall not renew it because I have just learned that you have on your staff a Roman Catholic and in defence you say you are not opposed to Romanism as a religion but only as to its political activities.

You cannot separate the two. The political activities are a part and a logical result of the religion. And that religion is in spirit and in every principle the exact opposite of the religion of Jesus. Witness its fruits everywhere and at every time that it has been dominant.

In my own parish in the industrial section of Philadelphia I run against its superstitions all the time, especially the magic of Baptism and Masses for the repose of souls. And the Church's use of gambling is a very great evil.

I am a radical. I have signed every petition you have prepared. I have the deepest sympathy for Jews and Negroes. And certainly I do not want Roman

Catholics persecuted; though they persecute Protestants mercilessly in the Post Office, Police and Fire Departments. But I know my Church History too well (having the degree of S.T.M. from our Cambridge Seminary) and I have seen at too close hand the working of Romanism in the lives of ordinary people to be capable of any support of or compromise with that devil's version of Christianity.

REV. JOHN H. LEVER, *Rector*
Free Church of St. John
Philadelphia, Pa.

Falls for Niemoeller

The occasion to address these lines to you is . . . one of complete disgust with one of the articles in the recent June-July issue entitled "Onward Christian Nazis" by Leo Stein. . . . Whatever one branch of the Protestant Church in Germany may have done during the days of the Republic and during the rise of Nazism, it is rancor of a wild propagandist to class Pastor Martin Niemoeller with this same group.

E. TISCHHAUSER

August 23

Cibola, Texas

(The above is an extract indicating the content of a long letter. Unfortunately for Mr. Tischhauser's argument, Martin Niemoeller, as pastor of the wealthy and exclusive Jesus Christ Church in Dablem, Berlin, did preach for the cause of the Nazi Party, he did lecture throughout Germany in favor of Hitler, and he did ring his church bells and offer a special service of thanksgiving when Hitler came to power. He was against the democratic government after World War I and his outlook was similar to that of the Roman Catholic forces who opened the way for Hitler. He only opposed the Nazi program, after Hitler obtained political control, where it affected the authority of the Church. Even so, his services to the Nazis had been so great that he was not removed from his pulpit until 1937 and was given special privileges when confined to a concentration camp, privileges which permitted him to live in comfort. On the outbreak of war, he did offer his services to the Nazi military. Since his release he has shown himself to be a reactionary, opposed to the development of a democratic Germany, and is apparently cooperating with those of like mind in the Roman Catholic Church. A chaplain, who had several discussions with him in Naples this year, reports that he praised the Pope, urged that the German generals and industrialists be not regarded as war criminals, pleaded that all Christians band together for a holy war against "atheistic Bolshevism," insisted that the Western nations, including Germany, must now have the major objective of defeating Russia and indicated his dislike of the Jews from the East. We agree with this chaplain when he concludes: "My version of Niemoeller would be that he is nothing more nor less than a refined Nazi." Editor)

Red Letter Day

A Red Letter Day, today when your long awaited but enlightening magazine arrived. Each copy, as it arrives and is read, will certainly be passed on. We, in the Armed Forces, need to be shown the broadmindedness which your publication represents.

M/Sgt. W. K.

c/o Postmaster, San Francisco